

A *11 g h*
Charge of Heresy,

Maintained against
*Mr. DODWEL's late Epistolary
Discourse, concerning the
Mortality of the SOUL.*

By Way of ADDRESS to the
C L E R G Y
OF THE
CHURCH of ENGLAND.

Laying open his Opposition to the receiv'd
Creeds, and his *Falsification* of all Sa-
cred and Profane Antiquity.

By EDM. CHISHULL, B. D. late Chaplain
at Smyrna, and Fellow of C. C. C. Oxon.

*Et ego intelligo, & Tu non negas, & Quivis sapiens pervidet,
Te non tam prolixè tractasse, nisi ut Ecclesiam Catholicam
tuis Tractatibus indignè pulsares. Sed, ut intelligi datur,
aliud habet Animus; aliud resonat Sermo. S Optat. l. i. c. 3*

L O N D O N:

Printed for Samuel Manship, at the Ship near
the Royal-Exchange in Cornhill, 1706.

10



92g

PREFACE.

MR. Dodwel's late Epistolary Discourse, which has attempted nothing less than to new model the whole Scheme of Christianity, abounds with such a variety of Conjecture, and with so many effusions of an indigested Learning, that I thought it could not better be refuted, than by severing all these from the Point in Question; and by putting the whole Controversy upon the Issue of two plain Particulars; viz. the falsity of his Principal Proposition, and the extravagance of his Principal Design.

The Principal Proposition of his Discourse has prov'd, perhaps, the greatest Cheat that ever was yet put upon those Pretenders to Reason, the Sceptics and the Atheists of the Age. For a presumptuous offer, to prove from the Scriptures, and the First Fathers, that the Soul is naturally Mortal, was what came up so fully to the Gust and Wishes of those Men, that it soon tempted 'em to change their Principles; it invited 'em to quit Reason for Authority; and to listen to a sort of Testimony, of which they always had the least esteem, viz. the Testimony of the Scriptures,

P R E F A C E

and the Fathers of the Church. But they have been so amus'd upon the Event of this Enquiry ; have seen so little a Performance of so great a Promise ; that instead of triumphing o're Religion, they scoff rather at their new Guide, and are offended at that groundless Boast, that has led them thus unseasonably out of the way, to Fountains they can neither relish, nor digest.

These are they who have been most deluded by our Author's Principal Proposition : But 'tis the Church which has been most affronted by his Principal Design. For 'twas not for Nothing, that He has suppos'd the Soul to be Mortal of its own Nature : 'Twas to assert a Power of Immortalizing it in the Members of his Communion ; and to justify his Schism by those Pretences, which none, since the Gnostic Tribe, ever pleaded against the Church. Whilst ordinary Schismatics pretend only more Light, or greater Purity, this Gentleman has pretended to be of a different Nature from other Men. He imagines He has been chang'd most mysteriously, He, and All whom He esteems truly Catholic, from Mortal into Immortal Beings : and this strange Transubstantiation He attributes to the Baptism of his Church, upon as little Grounds, as That other has been ascrib'd to the Lord's Supper, in the Church of Rome. But instead
of

P R E F A C E.

of contending with Him for this Power of Immortalizing Souls, or disputing whether 'tis the mighty Privilege of his, or of our Communion; I have endeavour'd in the following Discourse to explode the Notion as Heretical. To this end, I have discover'd it to be all along accompanied with so much Error and Imposture, to be founded upon such an Opposition to the Church, and so abusive a misconstruction of the Holy Fathers, that the attempt must plainly turn to the confusion of its Author; and instead of erecting his Party into a Church, it must be construed to be an undoubted mark and aggravation of their Schism.

In the mean time, I look upon this Debate to be so purely Theological in all its Branches, and the Doctrine of the Soul in General to be so strictly their Province, to whom the Care of particular Souls is committed by Almighty God, that, tho' 'tis made Public to all those who shall think it their concern, yet I have address'd it more particularly to the Judgment of my Superiors in the Church. For by this means one unseasonable Trouble which this Controversy has now given to the World, may be confin'd to the Enquiries of those Men, who are to watch against every Shipwreck of our Faith, and to ward off all pernicious Blows that thus threaten the whole Fabric of Religion. As

PREFACE.

As for that Painful Layman who has engaged the Church in this Dispute, his Modesty will, I hope, excuse me, if I have expressed my self somewhat freely concerning the size of his Judgment and Understanding; and if I rank him only in that lower Class of Learned Men, who are indeed fitted for the collecting of Materials, but are unqualified to judge rightly of, and to reason upon what they shall collect. Yet 'tis not because I would detract from any degree of Reputation He may claim: 'Tis because I would lessen that Authority under which He propagates his Errors; and because I think Mankind to have a fairer right to Truth, than He to that Character, in which He Glories, by a false and mistaken Learning. But if it shall be the Fortune of this Discourse, to give that Idea of our Adversary's Abilities, which I have long since entertain'd from the strain of all his Writings; Nothing will hereafter be believ'd, because produc'd by Mr. Dodwel: but on the contrary, it will be question'd for that very reason; and will be suspected of Heterodoxy, Novelty, and Singularity, till it has been submitted to the common Test of Truth, and warranted by the Impartial Verdict of Reason and Religion.

Advertisement.

☞ The READER may please to Note,
That the Title of Mr. *Dodwel's* Book
is at large expressed after this manner.

*A*N Epistolary Discourse, Proving from the Scriptures, and First Fathers, that the Soul is a Principle naturally Mortal; but Immortaliz'd actually by the Pleasure of God to Punishment, or to Reward, by its Union with the Divine Baptismal Spirit. Wherein is Proved, that None have the Power of giving this Divine Immortalizing Spirit, since the Apostles, but only the Bishops. Lond. 1706.

This Title he pretends to justify by distinguishing betwixt Soul and Spirit, and, (as a Consequence thereof) by dividing all Mankind into *Psychical* and *Pneumatical*, i. e. into *Animal* and *Spiritual*; according to this clear View, which may here be taken of his Hypothesis: *Viz.*

1. That (a) the Soul of Man (if consider'd without any new Indulgence, beyond what it receiv'd at its Creation) is naturally Mortal.

2. That (b) by virtue of a Divine Pnoë (i. e. that Breath of Life which God breathed into Adam's Nostrils) the Soul is however qualified for the Privilege of Immortality.

3. That (b) the Soul thus qualified, is farther capable of receiving a Divine Pneuma, (or Spirit) by which, as by a new and adventitious Principle, such particular Souls, as shall receive it, are actually Immortaliz'd.

(a) Epist. Disc. pag. 33, &c. (b) See Prem. Sect. 4. and Epist. Disc. Sect. 33, 38, 60.

4. That

Advertisement.

4. That (c) this Pnoë (or Breath) is common to every Man, from the time of his first natural Formation; but that the Pneuma (or Spirit) can now be convey'd no otherwise, since the Promulgation of the Gospel, but by Christian Baptism.

5. That (d) 'tis not all Baptism that is capable of conveying the Divine Immortalizing Spirit, but such only as is administred in Communion with the True Bishop.

6. That (e) as for those who never receive this Immortalizing Spirit, by reason of their having liv'd under an absolute Ignorance of the Gospel, their Souls, do sometime or other, actually fall under Annihilation, and their Bodies have no share in the Resurrection of the Dead.

7. That (f) as for those who (tho' acquainted with the Gospel, yet) never receive the Immortalizing Spirit, by reason of any Neglect or Irregularity, particularly the want of Episcopal Communion, or of Communion with the True Bishop, their Souls are not indeed suffer'd to fall under Annihilation, but are Immortaliz'd, by the extraordinary Pleasure and Power of Almighty God, to Eternal Punishment.

Such is the strange Hypothesis which I thought necessary to be attack'd, by a Discourse according to the ensuing Plan. And as the *First Part* of this, containing the Three first Chapters, is now presented to the World: So the *Second*, containing the Two latter, shall follow in due Time.

(c) Epist. Disc. Sect. 38, 40. (d) Præm. Sect. 9. Epist. Disc. pag. 297. (e) Epist. Disc. Sect. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 34, 35, 36. (f) Præm. Sect. 2, 3, 5. Epist. Disc. pag. 42.

The PLAN of the following
DISCOURSE.

CHAP. I.

By way of INTRODUCTION:

Containing some general Reflections on the Novelty, the Occasion and the Mischief, of Mr. Dodwel's Epistolary Discourse; with the State and Division of his Hypothesis, and a triple Charge of Heresy then form'd against it, as contrary to the receiv'd Doctrine of the Church; to the Tradition of the first Fathers; and to the Honour of the Holy Scriptures.

CHAP. II.

Proving the Charge of Heresy against Mr. Dodwel's Epistolary Discourse; First, as it derogates from the known Belief of the Church, concerning the Universality of the Resurrection, and the Everlasting Existence of all Human Souls: And Secondly, as it opposes the Church in the Controversy that has been long settled concerning the Validity of Christian Baptism in separate Communions: Concluding with a detection from what Source this Heresy is borrow'd.

B

CHAP.

C H A P. III.

Continuing the same Charge of Heresy against this Epistolary Discourse, as contrary to the Tradition of the First Fathers : With an Aggravation of this Charge by Mr. Dodwel's injuriously misrepresenting their Opinions, in favour of what he advances concerning the Soul's Natural Mortality.

C H A P. IV.

Continuing the same Charge of Heresy against this Epistolary Discourse, as contrary to the Tenour of Holy Scripture ; with the like Aggravation of that Charge, by Mr. Dodwel's forc'd Interpretation of the Divine Oracles, and his straining them to represent the Soul as a Principle naturally Mortal.

C H A P. V.

By way of CONCLUSION :

Showing the Traces of Mr. Dodwel's Notions in some trifling Remains of Antiquity, and the heinousness of his forming these into a pompous Hypothesis ; in order to Unchurch the greatest part of Christianity, and to magnifie the Pretensions of his Schism.

A
Charge of H E R E S Y,
Maintained against
Mr. Dodwel's Epistolary Dis-
course, &c.

C H A P. I.

By way of INTRODUCTION.

Most Reverend, Right Reverend, Reverend, &c.

A Sense of our Common Christiani-
ty, but more particularly of the
Obligations of the Ministerial Of-
fice, emboldens me to lay before
you what I have to say against a Book, the
Title of which I have not the hardiness to
transcribe.

YOU, who are so eminently entrusted,
by Almighty God, with the Care of Pretious

B 2

Souls,

Souls, cannot but have Reflected with an inexpressible Remorse on the late bold Attempts, to disprove their Immortality. After Mr. *Asgil* had amus'd the World with an Hypothesis concerning the Immortality of the Body, nothing could have match'd that Absurdity in this Sceptical unbelieving Age, but an express Treatise concerning the Mortality of the Soul. But that this ungrateful and unhallowed Work, should be reserv'd for the Learned Mr. *Dodwel*; that a Man so well Vers'd in venerable Antiquity, and so familiarly Conversant with the first Fathers and Builders of Christianity, should ever employ himself in picking up such Dirt from so many Golden remains; is a thing almost as shocking as the Title of that surprizing Book. Indeed, I ever thought, that his dark, abstruse, unintelligible way of Reasoning, was an Argument of a very unsound Judgment: I was indeed, always of Opinion, that whenever he should desert his wonted course of heaping up Chronological matters, sometimes to good, sometimes to bad purpose, and sometimes to no purpose at all; That he would then make a Discovery wherein his great strength lay: and convince the World, that he had a larger Talent of Memory and Imagination, than of the nobler Faculties

Faculties of the Mind. 'Twas indeed natural to imagine, that his Supercilious way of Dictating to all ranks of Men, on all Occasions, in all his Writings, and in all his Conversation, savour'd of a sort of Pride, which might be followed in a short time with some shameful fall. But that he should ever fall so very low as he has done ; that he should be so far sunk in the very Dregs of Heresy ; that he should go so far hand in hand with the Atheists and Libertines of the Age : Is what no considering Person can ever wonder or deplore enough. Yet even here may we make a good use of this unlook'd for Accident, and imploy it to the Confirming of us in one known and common Observation ; viz. That Schism seldom ever goes unaccompanied with Heresy ; and that no Body was ever long preserv'd from Error ; that had been so presumptuous, as to desert *the Pillar and Ground of Truth.*

2. 'Tis now a long while, that Mr. *Dodwel* has been a Separatist from the Church, and acted the Chief Ruler amongst a sort of Men, that give themselves the Title of the Church of *England*. He has been very free in determining how far this, and all other Establish'd Churches in the World, are in a state of Heathenism. 'Tis

a common thing with him to talk much of, and to prescribe Bounds to the *Peculium* ; *i. e.* to tell Almighty God who are, and who are not his People ; and to deny that our Saviour has *any Sheep that he knows not of*. 'Tis notorious, that he has made a long and lamentable Appeal to all Foreign Christians, as well Popish as Reform'd : Though there is none of them that he himself has not haughtily Condemned ; nay, though he has the hardiness in that very Appeal, to tell them, that they are all tainted with too much Novelty, to be Qualified for his Judges. He there falsely Ac-

* *Paran. p. 4. & 224.* cuses this Church and State, of having set up *

Altar against Altar ; he injuriously Infinites, that when the Government was under a late Unhappy necessity of removing some Non-juring Bishops from their Jurisdiction, it undertook at the same time to deprive *

* *Page 5. and 231.*

them of their Spiritual Function. He hereupon proceeds to brand their Successors, and all who Communicate with them by the name of Schismatics. Nay, he abuses the Authority of *S. Cyprian*, to the Stigmatizing every Member of our Church with the Title of *

* *Page 5. and 224.*

Profane Persons, Strangers to Catholic Communion,

munition, to Christ, and to all the Benefits of Christ. Words, for which he may be thought to have fall'n under the *Anathema* of the Ninth Canon, and may be deem'd by all those who have any value for the Sanctions of the Church, as Excommunicated *ipso facto*. This it would become him to consider, rather than to go on deluding himself with Self-Love and Self-Conceit; while in his *Epistle Dedicatory*, he mistakes the mildness of his Superiors for the reverence of his *Adversaries*; and seems himself to be astonish'd, that all these Defiances have been made without extorting the least Censure from our Parliaments, our Ecclesiastical Courts, or our Convocation. Perhaps indeed, a due Answer to Mr. *Dodwel*, is an Honour reserv'd to the Senate of his own Country, which has lately been very Exemplary in Animadverting upon Two of their other celebrated Authors. But here, his Superiors have all along, treated him with a remarkably Christian Patience; and have permitted him to enjoy the benefit of a Moderation, which may have been due to him in common, with Dissenters of less Knowledge and weaker Consciences. But God, who is often pleas'd to destroy the Wisdom of the Wise, and to manifest his Just Judgments upon Men of Perverse and

Arrogant Understandings ; has at last overtaken this Ecclesiastical Writer with *his own Subjects* ; and by suffering him to fall into so gross an *Heresy*, has given the truest Proof of the Obstinacy and Groundlessness of his *Schism*.

3. And here, you will admit of no stop to these Reflections, from what may be perhaps suggested concerning the Piety and Learning of Mr. *Dodwel*. I will not dispute with him or any Man, the Validity of these pretences ; yet I humbly conceive, that the World has seen no great Test of his Piety in the design, or of his Learning in the management of this performance. That Man has given but a poor Instance of his Learning, that has cast a mist over the great Truths of our Religion, by a confus'd jangling of *Gr.* and *Latin* Phrases ; that brings Authors as Evidence of his Opinions, who in the very words he puts into their mouths declare against him ; that mistakes Terms, Sentences, and Inferences ; and is unable after all, to speak clearly and intelligibly to his Readers. But he has favour'd us with a less agreeable relish of his Piety, by his coming out (against the repeated Advice of true Friends and better Judgments) with an unheard of, and unparallel'd Hypothesis, to restrain the hopes
of

of a Blessed Immortality to his own little Congregation, to prove, that the greatest part of Human-Race are liable to Dye the Death of Brutes, and to rectifie by these or the like fond Conceits, the whole Scheme and Tenor of Christianity.

4. But were the Piety or the Learning of any Innovator never so unquestionable, the more warrantable will be the Zeal of the Church against him. There is the more danger to be fear'd, and the more Hypocrisy to be detested in the Attempt : A Learned Heretic is an arm'd Enemy, and Schism under the mask of Piety, is like Rebellion for the sake of God and the King. 'Twere therefore Inexcusable, to be a tame and cowardly looker on, while the Ancient Bulwarks of Religion are pull'd down by a shew of Learning, and new ones are Erected in their place, by a specious pretence to Piety. No, such an one is powerfully to be convinc'd, that he is doing the Atheist's Work : *i. e.* (as I shall set it down in the Words of Mr. Hooker, in order to add the greater Weight to the Observation) * *He is Destroying the principal Spurs and Motives to all Vertue, the Resurrection of the Dead, the Joys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the endless pains of the Wicked, yea above all things, the* Autho-

* *Eccles. Prel. pag. 191.*

Authority of the Scripture, because on these Points it evermore beareth, and the Soul's Immortality ; which granted, draweth easily after it the rest as a voluntary train.

5. Nor does it in any wise wave this Charge, if we are told that Mr. *Dodwel's* whole Opinion, if swallow'd at once with all its different Ingredients, is not liable to these poysonous Effects. No ; the Atheist and the Libertine are not to be cur'd at these bold adventures. They will single out of his complex Hypothesis whatsoever is to their own Palate, and what is otherwise they will as scornfully reject : They will complement Mr. *Dodwel's* Ambition, in subscribing to one part of his Opinion ; but they will be contented with Mankind to remain wholly ignorant of the rest. In a word, they will hereafter plead his Authority for the Natural Mortality of the Soul, and they will laugh at his Singularity for his Immortalizing Baptismal Spirit. I know not therefore upon what Strength of his own this Man relies, that is thus ready to rouse an unruly Monster, and hopes afterwards by Hooks and Cords to draw him whither he thinks fit. *Will he make a Covenant with Leviathan ? Will he take him for his Servant for ever ? Will he arm the Atheist and the Libertine with a Persuasion*

suasion of the Soul's Natural Mortality; and then conjure this Weapon out of their Hands, by unfolding to them the Statutes of his College at *Ephesus*, and his College at *Jerusalem*; by charming them with the Privileges of his *Peculium*, and by fulminating on them with his Censures from the *Archetypal Church* in Heaven? Let him rather remember the wretched Scoff that was put upon him, for what he once vented concerning the Canon of Holy Scripture; and how Religion was then wounded thro' his sides, till she was again heal'd very happily, by more wary, and more skilful hands.

6. Out of tenderness to all those who may not as yet consider how far Mr. *Dodwel* has forfeited his former Character, I will not exaggerate his Case too far; i. e. I will not compare his Opinion with that of some Irreligious Persons, who have maintained the Mortality of the Soul either before or since the Gospel. Otherwise I might tell him of a late *French* Author, who was infamous all his Life-time, for having advanc'd this Principle in some Poetical Pieces, particularly in one, where he revives* those Stoical Dreams of the *Chorus*, in the second Act of

* *Quaris quo jacens post obitum loco?
Quo non nata jucent. ———
Mors individua est, nexa Corpori;
Nec parcens Anima ——— &c.*

the

the *Troas* of *Seneca*. Yet I would have mentioned this with an intent only of reminding Mr. *Dodwel* how sorely the same Person was afflicted for it on his Death-bed, and how fain he would have persuaded his Confessor to have given him the Sacrament in that only manner he thought himself worthy of receiving it; *i. e.* in the middle of his Chamber, with a Halter about his Neck.

7. But it may be of use to others, tho' of none probably to himself, if I compare this Opinion of Mr. *Dodwel*'s with that of some other Men, who have expressed themselves with more reserve concerning the Condition of Human Souls, and with a fairer pretence of Piety, but yet have been justly censur'd for doing a Disservice to Religion. Those I shall mention on this Head are Mr. *Lock*, Monsieur *d' Ablancourt*, and *Petrus Pomponatius*. Though that I may do no Injustice to the two former, their Principles are carefully to be distinguish'd. *Pomponatius* has publicly maintain'd, that if we have recourse to bare Natural Reason, there is more evidence for the Mortality of the Soul: Mr. *Lock* and Monsieur *d' Ablancourt* suppose only, that there is nothing in Natural Reason sufficient to demonstrate its Immortality.

But

But neither they, nor any other Christian Writer, ever drop'd any thing that came up to the unsanctified Title of this Book, *viz. The Soul proved from the Scriptures, and the first Fathers, to be a Principle naturally Mortal, &c.* They all confess the Soul to be a Principle naturally Immortal: They say only that they are obliged for this Discovery to Divine Revelation: and thereupon they enlarge themselves very plausibly, as putting the Immortality of the Soul upon a truer bottom, and a greater degree of Evidence, than the best which ever can be furnish'd from the Light of Nature. Yet even these, as I have said, were justly censur'd for having ventur'd too far in the Disservice of Religion. Not because this, or any other Article of our Faith, becomes the less credible, the less force there is in Human Reason to maintain it; but because upon this account it becomes credible to fewer Persons, and can be no longer useful for converting those who, either within or without the Pale of the Church, are still in need of being enlighten'd by Natural Arguments. 'Tis for the sake of these Persons that we are to conceive an Heterodoxy in Philosophy, as well as in Religion; and that we are to set a Mark of Honour and Soundness upon some

some Principles, which seem so fundamental that they cannot be controverted without intrenching upon common Vertue, and the good Oeconomy of the World. Upon such a Reasoning as this, *Boccalini* has acquitted himself as a good Casuist, in turning the above-mention'd Distinction of *Pomponatus* on his own Head. With his usual Pleasantry he summons that Author to a Visitation of *Apollo*, and dispatches him in a manner not improper to be describ'd at large. (*Ragguagli di Parnasso*, cent. I. rag. 90.) *Tutto sudicio poi, &c. i. e. There afterwards appear'd in this Visitation very slovenly and very ill accountred, one Pietro Pomponatio, a Fellow who had been convicted of writing a Book, in which he labours by foolish and sophistical Arguments to prove, that the Soul of Man is Mortal. Apollo not able to endure that Miscreant in his sight, gave order that his Library should be immediately set on fire, and that so great a Villain should be burnt in those very Flames; for that the Blockhead was unworthy of the Benefit of Books, who from them had troubled himself to prove, that Men were Beasts. Upon this Pomponatio roar'd out with a most lamentable Exclamation, and protested that he believed the Mortality of the Soul only, as a Philosopher. Apollo therefore*
turn'd

turn'd round to the Executioners, and bid 'em burn him only as a Philosopher. I will not apply this Sentence to the Man who believes the Mortality of the Soul, not only as a Philosopher but as a Christian; yet I think I have a Right to ask him why he did not suppress his darling Book for three very good Reasons, upon account of which we are told that *Pomponatius* retracted his: *Viz.* 1. Out of regard to the intreaty of his Friends. 2. Out of concern for the Honour of his good Name. And 3. Out of pure Conscience, and a sense of Obedience to the Church. To the two former of these Reasons Mr. *Dodwel* is already lost; but I wish he may have a Christian Regard to what I shall now urge to him from the last.

8. For in hopes of doing Justice to our common Christianity, and of rescuing it from the Imputation of having taught the Natural Mortality of the Soul, I shall now bring against him no flight or trivial Accusation; *viz.* not that of dissenting from the School of *Plato* and *Pythagoras*, who though censur'd by *Tertullian*, as the *Patriarchs of all Heretics*, were yet Orthodox as to the Immortality of the Soul; not that of contradicting the voice of Nature, and the common Consent of Nations, which

* Tusc. Quest. Lib. 1.
Si omnium consensu, natura vox est; omnesque qui ubique sunt, consentiunt esse aliquid quod ad eos pertineat qui vitâ cesserint; nobis quoque idem existimandum est. And again, *permanere animos arbitramur consensu omnium nationum.*

which as we are told by * Cicero, declare likewise for the Souls natural Immortality; but the Accusation I shall now bring against him, is that of Dissenting from Scripture, from the First Fathers, from the Councils, the Creeds, and the Articles

of the Church of Christ. There was a time, when this Gentleman was only liable to the charge of Heresy improperly so call'd, and that upon a less flagrant Offence, than what he has now given to the Church in his Epistolary Discourse. I mean, as the name of Heretic is by the Sixth Canon of the Council of Constantinople Consignificant to that of Schismatic. *Ἀρσιπικὸς δὲ λέγεται . . . καὶ τὸς τὴν πίστιν μὲν τὴν ὀρθὴν θεωροῦντας*

ὁμολογεῖν, ἀποσχέτας δὲ καὶ ἀλλοτρίων τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡμῶν Ἐπισκόποις. i. e. *We likewise include those under the Title of Heretics (say the Fathers of that Second General Council) who tho' they make a shew of confessing a sound Faith, yet separate themselves, and set up Congregations against our Regular Bishops.* But Schism, which is always haunted by Two very mischievous Companions, i. e. an Ambition to exalt it self, and a Con-
 sciousness

sciousness * of its still being in the wrong, has now betray'd this Unwary Writer, into an Heresy of a more gross and more unquestion'd Sort. Being destitute of all obvious and common Topics which might serve to justify his Separation, he has discover'd the truest Marks of a forlorn Cause, and fled to those that are extravagant. Not content, with having thundred out his Anathemas upon the Church; he has proceeded to carry on the Insult, even against Human Nature: Denying to the Church of which he was once a Member, the ordinary Methods of Salvation: And to Human Nature, that perpetuity of Existence, which in the Language of the Ancient Christians, is said to be *

* *Falsitatis Rei deprehensi, pertinaci dissentione firmata, in Hæresin Schisma vertunt.* Aug. de Hæres.

9. Now it is not to be expected, but that as soon as the Parent of these New Productions, shall be Attacked and Pressed, and Straitned with the Inconveniences which they carry with them, he will immediately be apt to change his shape. But whenever he does, he is the more vigorously to be urg'd and pursued

* Πρὸς τὸ χρεωστῆσαι αὐτὸ τῇ λογικῇ καὶ ἀνθρώπων φύσει. λέγουσιν ὅτι τὸ διαιωνίζεν. Constitut. Apost. Lib. 5. Cap. 7.

in all the *new Forms* he shall put on, till at last he shall either resume such an one as is agreeable to other Men, or the same in which he was first surpriz'd. This was the Case of all those antient Heretics, who by reason of their greater Learning gave the greater Trouble to the Church ; as *Arius*, *Apollinaris*, *Pelagius* and *Nestorius*. No sooner were their Principles call'd in question by their Superiors, but they were all ready to distinguish them away by Forms of Confession, Declarations and Expositions. But being closely held to their Terms by the Able and Orthodox Managers of those Controversies, the Poison broke out in all : and they therefore still remain under the Penalty and the Example of an Anathema to all Ages.

10. Mr. *Dodwel* in like manner will undoubtedly have recourse to these Evasions: He will plead that he has Explanations of his Hypothesis to be made, and that in the mean time he suffers under the Mistakes and Misrepresentations of his Answerers. Nay even in the very Book which first brought his Notions into the World, being as it were conscious of their Deformity, he is often licking and moulding them into a better appearance : I mean, that being sick as it were of his own Assertions, and conscious

scious of the several Objections which grew more and more upon his Thoughts, he has now and then interspers'd some Modifications of the Hypothesis, and mitigated it by Exceptions and Distinctions, for the Palate of the Reader. This is most observable in the 38th and 60th Paragraph of his Discourse; and 'tis therefore with an eye to these that I shall form the following Propositions, as the most allow'd and confess'd Plan of his Opinion; namely,

1. That the Soul of Man is a Principle naturally Mortal, according to the Scriptures, and first Fathers of the Church.

2. That the Soul, tho' naturally Mortal, is endued with a Divine Pnœ, by which it is qualified for the Privilege of Immortality.

3. That the Soul thus qualified is farther capable of a Divine Pneuma, by which, and which alone, all Human Souls are to be actually Immortaliz'd.

4. That the Pnœ is given by God to every Man at his Birth, but that the Pneuma can be now convey'd no otherwise, since the Promulgation of the Gospel, but by Christian Baptism.

5. That 'tis not all Baptism that is capable of conveying the Divine Pneuma, but such only as is administred in Communion with the true Bishop.

6. That as for those who never receive the Divine Pneuma, by reason of their having liv'd under an absolute Ignorance of the Gospel, their Souls do, sometime or other, fall under an actual Mortality, and their Bodies have no share in the Resurrection of the Dead.

7. That as for those who (tho' acquainted with the Gospel, yet) never receive the Divine Pneuma, by reason of any Neglect or Irregularity, particularly the want of Episcopal Communion, or of Communion with the true Bishop, their Souls are not left to fall under actual Mortality, but are Immortaliz'd by the expresse Pleasure of God to endless Damnation.

II. In this abstract of his Opinions, (which may be warranted from his own words, tho' deliver'd with great Intricacy, Confusion, and Inconsistency, nay, some-

* As *Præm* Pag. 26. Not that the *Flatus* was it self Immortal, but *Disc.* Pag. 301. the *Flatus* it self was Immortal also.

times with expresse * Contradiction to himself;) The Proposition which is last in Order, was however first in In-

tention : and is the darling Notion for which the World has been indebted to him for the whole Scheme. To say nothing how far it affects the Churches of the *Roman* or the *Greek* Communion ; in the first place it thunders the Sentence of Damnation

on upon all those who shall receive no other Baptism than that of the present *Church of England*. And if Mr. *Dodwel* ever drops his Controversy with this Church (*upon a case he seems to have in view*) then indeed his *Anathema* is so mild, as to damn only every Member of every other Re-form'd Congregation under Heaven : forasmuch as since the extinction of the *Bohemian Church*, and the alteration of that of *Transylvania*, not one of them are in Episcopal Communion ; whatever may have been vulgarly conceiv'd concerning the Churches of either of the two *Northern Crowns*. Thus wide is Mr. *Dodwel's* Sentence of Damnation, never to be read without an abhorrence of its rash Uncharitableness, by all those who can avoid that improper Question, *Lord, what shall this Man do ?* and attend only to that Admonition of our Saviour, *Follow thou me*.

12. But here he has shot an Arrow which rebounds with a mortal edge upon himself : For this Sentence, and this occasion of its delivery, must needs paint him to all the World, as an exact Copier of the Schism and Heresy of the *Donatists* : Of their Schism in the manner of his separating from the *Church of England*, and of their Heresy in his thus pronouncing upon

the Church which he has left. The tryal of this Charge I put upon these plain words of St. *Austin* (lib. de Hæres. num. 69.) *Donatistæ sunt qui primum propter Cæcilianum, contra suam voluntatem, ordinatum Ecclesiæ Carthagenensis Episcopum Schisma fecerunt, objicientes ei Crimina non probata : — Sed post causam cum eo dictam atq; finitam falsitatis rei deprehensi, pertinaci dissensione firmatâ, in Hæresim Schisma verterunt. tanquam Ecclesia Christi propter crimina Cæciliani, seu vera, seu (quod magis iudicibus apparuit) falsa, de toto terrarum Orbe perierit, ubi futura promissa est, atq; in Africâ Donati parte remanserit, in aliis terrarum partibus quasi contagione communionis extincta : i. e. The Donatists are those who at first made a Schism on account of Cæcilian, Ordain'd, against his Will, Bishop of Carthage ; charging him with Crimes that were never prov'd. But being found guilty of a false Indictment, upon the tryal and determination of that Cause, they were hardened in their obstinate Separation, and turn'd their Schism into an Heresy. As if for the Crimes of Cæcilian, whether they were true, or (as it appear'd to the Judges of the Cause) whether they were false, the Church of Christ had perish'd from off the Face of the Earth, o'r which it was promis'd to be spread ; and remain'd only*

ly in Africa among the Partisans of Donatus, being extinct in all other parts of the World by a Contagion of Communion. To add, if possible, to the advantage of this comparison, let it be observ'd, that St. Austin makes no difference whether the Crimes of the accus'd Bishop were true or false : And with that Note, I here pass over this Unchristian Stumbling-block, till I shall again encounter it in the Conclusion of this Discourse.

13. Such was the Complexion of our Author's last odious Proposition ; which, to say nothing of Christian Charity, Human Nature must look upon, with a degree of Nauseousness, and regard as *the Dregs in a Cup of Poyson*. Had we nothing else to object against his Premises, 'twere enough to prejudice the fairest shew of Truth they might bring along with them, that they infer'd so unnatural a Conclusion. But in order to represent *them as plainly false, as this appears to be uncharitable* ; I shall now resolve the sum of his Six foregoing Propositions into such *Affertions as are Primary, and such as are Secondary* in the Debate.

14. By such Affertions as are *Secondary*, I mean the *Distinctions he much insists upon*,
 1. *Betwixt the Pnöe and the Pneuma* ; and
 2. *Betwixt the Soul and the Spirit* ; both

which are implied in the Tenor of the *first, second, and third Propositions* of his Scheme. Of these therefore I shall treat in the places where they most affect his *Hypothesis*, and shall shew that there is indeed no real, but only a verbal difference betwixt the *Pröe* and the *Pneuma*. But as for the difference which the Antients sometimes make betwixt the Soul and Spirit, this I shall explain more pertinently than he has done, and prove that it is altogether foreign to the fond Turn which he would serve. The Assertion of his *fifth Proposition* is likewise one of those which I understand by the name of *Secondary* : For tho' this indeed be a very bold Stroke, and allows no Christian Baptism to be valid, but such as is administred in a Congregation of Mr. *Dodwel's* own Model; yet is it so dependent upon the novel Assertions which go before, that if they be false, this has no pretence of being true : Tho' on the contrary, were they never so true, this, notwithstanding may be false. Leaving therefore this arrogant Assertion to take its Fate with those Absurdities from whence 'tis drawn, I only request at present that it may be confronted with St. *Cyprian's* just resentment, thus express'd in his 73. *Epis.*
Vult Ecclesie Catholicae Auctoritatem sibi &
Veri-

Veritatem vindicare, quando ipse in Ecclesia non sit, imò adhuc insuper contra Ecclesiam rebellis & hostis extiterit. Sciens etenim unum esse Baptisma, hoc unum sibi vindicat, ut apud se esse Ecclesiam dicat, & nos Hæreticos faciat : i. e. This Man will needs assume to himself the Truth and Authority of the Catholic Church : and this, even while he himself is no Member of the Church, nay farther, while he is a declar'd Rebel to, and an Enemy of the Church. For knowing that there is but one Baptism, he claims this one Baptism to himself; that so he may pretend his Party to be the Church, and us to be so many Heretics. Thus far St. Cyprian. But there is a Guilt of another sort to be charged upon this Assertion, by the Authority of St. Austin; and of that therefore I shall be mindful in its proper place.

15. But the chief and *primary Question in Debate is concerning the natural Mortality of the Soul.* This is what our Pious Writer is principally concern'd to prove, and which therefore it is our main Business to attack. For tho' all his *Secondary Points* might be baffled upon other Principles, if this were capable of Defence; yet, on the other hand, if this *Primary* one be once disprov'd, there is nothing, even in his own Pretensions, that can support the rest.

rest. 'Tis therefore the Fundamental Assertion of our Author, *That the Soul is a Principle naturally Mortal*, according to the *first* Proposition of his Scheme : and in the *sixth*, he still launches into a greater depth ; affirming, that some particular Souls may actually fall under Mortality, and that the Bodies once united to those Souls shall not be concern'd in the Resurrection of the Dead. This is the Point against which we are to bend our Force, and so by the Example of the *Nicene* Fathers, to drive our Author from all his Refuges in any unnecessary incidental Debate. Being tir'd with so many intricate Evasions, while the suspected Heretics were suffer'd to wander from the Question, They at length prudently concluded to confront them strictly with the *Homöusion* : And of this they soon experienc'd two very different Effects ; both equally decisive of the Controversy, and both equally glorious to the Church ; viz. they reclaim'd *Eusebius* from his Error, and they convicted *Arius* of his Heresy.

16. So desirous am I of being govern'd by this Example, that I shall not now protract the Question, by puzzling Mr. *Dodwel* about those many Immaterial Beings which he has slaughter'd betwixt *Adam* and *Moses*;
and

and many others betwixt *Moses* and *Christ*: The *πῶλοι ἰσθμοὶ ψυχῶν* those numberless noble Souls that may be requir'd at our *Hero's* Hands. But I shall now reduce the Controversy to the Issue of these plain Questions: viz. What are we now to believe, since the Promulgation of the Gospel, concerning the Condition of Human Souls? Is the Soul of Man a Principle naturally Immortal? Is every individual Soul to be perpetuated by Everlasting Life in the World to come? Is each individual Body to be restor'd in the General Resurrection? The affirmative of these Questions is the Doctrine of the Church; but the negative is the Doctrine of Mr. *Dodwel*: This therefore is what I now come to impeach of Heresy, after this following manner.

17. First, I shall bring a Charge of Heresy against these Opinions, as they are contrary to the receiv'd Doctrine of the Catholic Church. And here I should desire much less to be granted to me, than those Authentic Definitions of an Heretic: (Cod. lib. 1. Tit. 5. l. Omnes) *Hereticorum Vocabulo continentur . . . qui vel levi argumento a judicio Catholicae Religionis & tramite detecti fuerint deerrare*; i. e. Those are comprehended under the stile of Heretics, who swerve, even in any less important Point, from

from the Judgment and the known Path of the Catholic Religion. Or that of Photius, (Nomocan. Tit. 12. cap. 2.) Ἀρεπκός ἐστι καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς αἰρετικῶν ἀποκρίσει νόμοις, ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐκκλίνων τὸ ὀρθόδοξον πίστως. i. e. He is an Heretic, and is liable to the Laws concerning Heretics, who declines never so little from the Orthodox Faith. Nor shall I here take an estimate of the Churches Doctrine from the Unanimity of many Thousand Writers, who like so many Clouds of Witnesses declare for the Soul's natural Immortality. For we must remember that we are now disputing with a Person who stands singly in competition with all these, and professes to make no *Modern Sentiments his Rule*. But by the Doctrine of the Church, I shall now understand such as is to be collected from its own public Declarations and Formularies of Faith, receiv'd and profess'd in all Ages, till we come up to those Times in which our Adversary is willing to accept the Tradition of particular Fathers, for a Test of Apostolical Truth. And tho' he is as Magisterial in protesting against the Consent of Churches as against the Sentiments of single Men (see §. 9. and 50.) yet here I shall not take the like notice of his *Protest*; nor shall I regard all those haughty Declarations, any otherwise, than as they may

may be interpreted a stronger Argument of a ranker Heresy. For as our Municipal Laws can never allow of any Criminals insisting upon his being try'd by the Twelve *Cæsars*, rather than by Twelve honest Neighbours ; so neither can the Ecclesiastical admit of any Man's appealing from the Church of this, to the Church of the First Age ; or from the Church on Earth to the Church in Heaven. On the contrary, the Church being thus slighted, and thus refus'd to be heard by any of its proper Subjects, has Authority to proceed against him by an Indictment of another sort, and instead of bare *Heretic*, may proclaim him *an Heathen and a Publican*.

18. *Secondly*, I shall continue the same Charge of Heresy against these Opinions, as they are contrary to the Unanimous Tradition of the Primitive Fathers, and that from the first to the last of those by which our Author is willing to be try'd. For whereas Mr. *Dodwel* not only asserts the natural Mortality of the Soul, but presumes to vent this very pompously as the joint Opinion of many Learned and Pious Fathers of the Church ; I trust to make it appear, on the other hand, that not only the majority, but almost all that he cites on that occasion declare against him ; and therefore

therefore this must be understood to be not only a Charge of Heresy, but of Prevarication likewise and Imposture ; and a scandalous Subornation of so many Orthodox and Holy Persons to appear as false Witnesses *against their own Souls*. God only preserve us from the Sin of *Vincentius Lirinensis*, who affirms it to be a kind of Sacrilege not to think that such Impostors shall burn for ever with the Devil. A Punishment, says he, (cap. II.) which God seems to have revealed on purpose against the Fraud of some Men, *Qui cum sub alieno nomine Heresin concinnare machinentur, captant plerumq; veteris cujuspiam Viri scripta paulo involutius edita, quæ pro ipsâ sui obscuritate dogmati suo quasi congruent : Ut illud, nescio quid, quodcunq; proferunt, neq; primi, neq; soli, sentire videantur. Quorum ego nequitiam duplici odio dignam judico : vel eo, quòd Hæreseos venenum propinare aliis non pertimescunt : vel eo etiam, quòd sancti cujusq; Viri memoriam, tanquam sopitos jam cineres, prophanâ manu ventilant ; & quæ silentio sepeliri oportebat, redivivâ Opinione diffamant. i. e. Who when they are in a Plot to form an Heresy under anothers name, catch at a few intricate Passages of some Venerable Antient, which on the mere score of Obscurity, seem to fall in with their Design :*
and

and this forsooth, that they may be thought not to have been the first, or the only, Abettors of the Trash which they would vent. The Villany of these Men deserves, I think, a double Resentment : In the first place, because they presume to palm their Heresy upon Mankind : And in the next, because they profanely rake into the Memory, as into the dead Ashes, of so many Holy Persons ; and expose, by some reviv'd Opinions, what might better have slept in Silence.

19. Thirdly, I shall continue the same Charge of Heresy against these Opinions, as they are contrary to the clear and uncontested Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures. Nor are we so much to wonder that even this Authority is likewise pleaded for Mr. Dodwel's new Hypothesis ; and that the profane Title-page assumes the Testimony of Scripture, as well as of the first Fathers for the Soul's natural Mortality. On the contrary, had not this been so positively pretended, we had wanted one very authentic Evidence, by which Heresy is most likely to be convicted. For *Heretics*, says Vinc. Lirin. (cap. 35.) *never produce any thing of their own, which they endeavour not to shelter under words of Scripture.* Even This therefore must be now added to the Charge ;

Charge ; and instead of any Advantage from the Scriptures which he cites, his Heresy will appear aggravated by a presumptuous Abuse of the Divine Oracles ; part of which he curtails, and part of which he misrepresents, according to that old Spirit and Practice of Heresy, describ'd at

* Τῆς αἵρετικῶν ὄψιν
ὑποδείξας, μέρθ' ἢ ὁρᾷ
λαβόντα τὴν γραφὴν καὶ τὸ
ὁρθογραφῶντα, δι' αὐτὰ
τὴν συκοφαντεῖν τὰ λοιπὰ.

large by *Enlogius** : (in *Photii Bibl. cod. 225.*)

which if any please to consult, they will find to be too true a Picture

of our Author's *Epistolary Discourse*.

20. This is the Triple Charge which in the following Chapters of this Discourse I hope to maintain against this fond Hypothesis, by clear and undoubted Proofs. At present I shall only add, that, in the Interpolated Epist. of *Pseudo-Ignatius* to the *Ephesians*, there are several very distinguishing Marks of Heresy very shrewdly put together under the Character of the τὸ πλάνον πνεῦμα. And these happen to agree so very unluckily to the Writings, if not to the Conversation, of our Author ; that before I proceed to a direct opening of the Cause, I cannot but offer 'em as a presumptive Evidence of the Indictment I have brought against him. Τὰ ἴδια λαλεῖ, αὐτάρεσκον γὰρ ὄντιν. Ἐαυτὸ δόξάζει, πύρε γὰρ ὄτι μισόν. Ψευδολόγον ὑπάρχει, ἀπατηλόν, δουλοπικρόν,

ὑπερόπκον, καλακάπκιν, ὑπελον ῥαψωδόν, φλυαεῖν, ἀσυμ-
 ρωνόν, ἀμειβεσιπῆς, γλισχρόν, ψοφοδαίς : i. e. as I
 shall translate the Particulars with some
 small Allowances, *He talks his own Noti-
 ons: for he is pleased not a little with him-
 self. He affects his own Glory: for he is
 somewhat addicted to Vanity. He is false in
 his Assertions, he is fraudulent in his Quo-
 tations, soft in his Addresses, pretty courtly to
 his Readers, good at disguising an Intention,
 a renown'd Botcher, insisting upon Trifles,
 inconsistent in his Hypotheses, endless of Dis-
 course, tenacious of his Opinions, and shy of
 the least word that sounds like a Reply.*

D

CHAP.

: C H A P. II.

Proving the Charge of Heresy against Mr. Dodwel's Epistolary Discourse : First, as it derogates from the known Belief of the Church concerning the Universality of the Resurrection, and the Everlasting Existence of all Human Souls : And Secondly, as it opposes the Church in the Controversy that has been long settled concerning the Validity of Christian Baptism in separate Communions : Concluding with a detection from what Source this Heresy is borrow'd.

WHAT I have before advanc'd was Introductory to my Design, and serv'd chiefly to distinguish the less principal from the principal Points of this *Hypothesis* ; that so the Mischief and the Fallshood of the whole may be expos'd under a nearer view, in these following Positions : *Viz. That the Soul in general is a Principle naturally Mortal : That some particular Souls shall fall under actual Mortality : And that the Bodies, once united to those Souls, shall have no share in the Resurrection of the Dead.* What therefore I now undertake in this Chapter, is to shew, that these

these are no indifferent undecided Points, left at large to be debated by Men of inquisitive Minds, and unsettled Principles : but on the other side, that the Church has here interpos'd its full Authority ; and declar'd so peremptorily for the absolute Resurrection of every individual Body, as also for the perpetual uninterrupted Existence of every individual Soul, that the contrary to this cannot now be suggested with any shew of Modesty or Piety ; much less, without the Imputation of a barefac'd Heresy, can it be publickly maintain'd, and pompously vented to the World. To this purpose, I shall *First*, urge the several Authentic Creeds or Breviaries of our Christian Faith, in which the Church sets as it were its public Seal to so many Articles of Belief ; thereby warranting them for express Doctrines of Holy Scripture, and such as are necessary to Salvation. And from the last Articles of all these, I shall prove that the Church has expressly declar'd for the Resurrection of every individual Body, and for the uninterrupted Existence of every individual Soul. *Secondly*, I shall shew that what Mr. *Dodwel* has here advanc'd, concerning the Condition of Human Souls, is liable to some public Censures of the Church ; by which the same, or like Opi-

nions have been actually branded as Heretical.

2. First therefore let us have recourse to the Authority of some antient Creeds : Not those, which only declare in general for the Resurrection of the Body, and so leave handle to some Men of interpreting them concerning a partial rather than an universal Resurrection ; but those, which are so express as to decide the Point, and to assert the actual Renovation of all Mankind. The first which I shall produce of this kind, is that which we find register'd as the Faith of the Universal Church, and as the Doctrine of the Apostles and their Disciples, by *S. Irenæus* : A Man of that Credit with *Mr. Dodwel*, that 'tis upon his Authority that he subscribes to the present Canon of the *New Testament*. Now one very remarkable Article of that *Creed* is happily calculated to this very purpose ; and declares, that Christ shall ἀναστήσει πάντας τοὺς νεκρούς ἀνθρώπους : (*lib. i. c. 2.*) i.e. He shall raise from the Dead not only all Flesh, but (as it is very emphatically express'd) all Flesh that ever was a part of all Human Nature. *Tertullian*, in a Book which he wrote on purpose to stop the mouth of Heresy, has there given us another Authentic *Creed*, in which an indispensable Re-

Resurrection, and an Eternity of Rewards or Punishments are attributed to the *Sancti & Profani*; i. e. to the two parts, as he there calls them, of all Mankind. The form of the Article is thus express'd, (*de Præscript. Hæret. cap. 12.*) *Jesum Christum venturum cum claritate ad sumendos sanctos in Vitæ æternæ & promissorum Cælestium fructum, & ad profanos adjudicandos igni perpetuo, factâ utriusq; partis resuscitatione, cum carnis restitutione.* Where 'tis to be observ'd, that *utriusq; partis*, i. e. the two parts of Mankind, is a Phrase plainly consiſſificant to the whole, which they completely divide: It being a receiv'd Notion in antient Philosophy, to reckon all Mankind under two *Seçs*, the one of *Good*, and the other of *Bad Men*; and Christianity continuing the same Notion under the Phrase of the *Holy* and the *Profane*, the *Righteous* and the *Wicked*, the *Just* and the *Unjust*. See here the positive decision of two venerable Formularies of Faith: A decision not now collected from any single Testimony of *Irenæus* or *Tertullian*; but transcrib'd from public and authentic Instruments of the Primitive Church; the Copies of which those Fathers have happily preserv'd to all Posterity.

3. That vulgarly stil'd the *Apostles Creed*, makes only a general Profession of believing the Resurrection of the Body, or as 'twas read in the Church of *Aquileia*, the Resurrection of this Body. But in that first authentic Copy which *Ruffinus* gave us of this *Creed*, there is a Comment which makes an ample amends for this, and at the same time affords a very considerable Testimony of the Soul's being then believ'd to be naturally Immortal. *Ita ergo unius-cujusq; carnis substantia quamvis variè & diversè dispersa sit, ratio tamen ipsa quæ inest unicuiq; carni immortalis est, quia immortalis animæ caro est. ita fit ut unicuiq; animæ non confusum aut extraneum corpus, sed suum quod habuerat, reparetur.* (Ruf. in Symb. Apost.) i. e. Tho' therefore the substance of every particular Body be variously and differently dispers'd; yet is there in every Body the Grounds of Immortality, because it is the Body of an Immortal Soul. And then it follows, Hence 'tis no confused or foreign Body that is restor'd to each particular Soul, but the same to which it was once united.

4. While this was generally understood to be the Sense of the Church, no wonder that this *Creed* was then read without the last Article concerning *Everlasting Life*. Yet
are

are we to observe that this was extant long before that time, as well in the *African Confessions*, as in the end of the *Jerusalem Creed*; and from thence probably 'twas translated *Anno 381*, into that of *Constantinople*. But whereas in the *Creed of Jerusalem* we profess to believe a *ζωὴ αἰώνιον*; i. e. a *Life Everlasting*; to prevent this being understood of a duration only in a *Life of Happiness*, those words in the *Creed of Constantinople*, are chang'd into *ζωὴν τὴν μέλλοντον αἰῶνα*; i. e. *the Life of the World to come*. A *Life* (as *Harmenopulus* has very clearly paraphras'd those words) *τὴν τὴν ὁ δικαίων ἐξαλλίστην αἰῶνα ἔχουσαν, καὶ τὴν τὴν ἀμαρτωλῶν κόλασιν αἰῶνα*: i. e. *A Life which comprehends the Everlasting Enjoyment of the Just, and the Everlasting Punishment of the Unjust*. (*Harmen. exp. Fidei in Fure Græco Rôm. pag. 554.*) The *ζωὴ αἰώνιον* therefore in the *Creed of Jerusalem*, the *ζωὴ τὴν μέλλοντον αἰῶνα* in the *Creed of Constantinople*; and besides them the *Vita æterna* of the *Apostles Creed*, (as it has been read and receiv'd in all the *Western Churches*, since the middle of the *Fifth Century*) is the *Voice of the whole Christian World*, attesting the *Restitution of every particular Body*, and the *uninterrupted Duration of every particular Soul*; contrary to this fond *Hypothesis*, in

which we are now taught to imagine, that some Souls may fall under actual Mortality, and some Bodies never be concern'd in the Resurrection of the Dead. For when the last Article, save one, had declar'd that *All* should rise, the last continues to assert that *All*, who ever rose, shall live for ever: and this not only a Life of Joy and Happiness, (to which the Phrase of *Everlasting Life* is sometimes appropriated) but a Life indefinitely understood, as it is a continuance of *Being*; happy to one part of Mankind, and unhappy to all the rest. This is a very just Exposition of *Life Everlasting* in the *Apostles Creed*, and no more than a literal one of *the Life in the World to come* in that of *Constantinople*: For which if any Modern Authorities may be pleaded, we have two very great ones in Bishop *Pearson* and Dr. *Barrow*. Yet I would here be understood, not to allege those Learned Expositors as Teachers of this Doctrine, but as Witnesses only that this is the Doctrine of the *Creed*.

5. That commonly call'd the *Athanasian Creed*, I come now to urge upon two different accounts; *viz.* not only as it is a confirmation of all the foregoing Forms, but principally as it is it self a Form of Faith, receiv'd with Veneration throughout

out the whole extent of Christianity. And here, without troubling our selves with any Uncertainties concerning the time in which it was first publish'd to the Church, and much less concerning the time in which it was first compil'd; 'tis enough that it was acknowledg'd for some Centuries before the Reformation, and since that eminently ratified by the Churches of *France*, *Germany*, and *England*, with an Attestation of its being thoroughly agreeable to the Word of God. And in truth, there cannot be a more exprefs agreement than there is betwixt some Testimonies of Holy Scripture, and the words which I shall here quote for the Universal Resurrection, and the uninterrupted Existence of all Mankind. *Ad cujus adventum omnes Homines resurgere habent, &c. i. e. At whose coming all Men shall rise again with their Bodies, and shall give account of their own Works: And they that have done good, shall go into Life Everlasting; and they that have done evil, into Everlasting Fire.* Now this is no more than a little variation of Phrase from the very words of our Blessed Saviour, *John 5. 28, 29. All that are in their Graves shall hear his Voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good, unto the Resurrection of Life; and they that have done evil,*
unto

unto the Resurrection of Damnation. This our Pious and Learned Author was aware of, and therefore he takes care to obviate this Text; and tells us, that according to a large manner of Expression usual with Eastern Writers, by *All that are in their Graves*, our Saviour meant, *some that are in their Graves*. A bold and flagrant Injury, not only to our Faith, but even to the Author of our Faith; with which nevertheless we must sit down contented, till in its proper place I come to the Vindication of our Lord's Expression. But in the mean time, here he is to be plainly told, that whatever Figures he presumes to put upon our Saviour; yet *Creeds* are no Figurative Compositions. In those, as *Ruffinus* says, nothing that is ambiguous or obscure must enter. 'Tis their chief, careful, primary Design, to express the Christian Faith in such words, as no Wit nor Malice might be able to draw to any second Sense. And therefore instead of understanding *some Men* instead of *All*, our Author must here do the same Right, as *Tertullian* has done, to *Omnis*. *Quid est Omnis*, (says he, *de Virg. vel.*) *nisi omnia* * *generis, omnis ordinis, omnis conditionis, omnis dignitatis, omnis etatis*? What is to be understood by *All*, but all kinds, ranks, and conditions in the World?

6. This

6. This open Violence offer'd to a plain Law of our Christian Faith, aggravated by those I have before mention'd, which were indeed as real, though not so obvious as this, is that for which I fix the Crime of Heresy on these Opinions of Mr. *Dodwel*. I only add, that he who could distinguish away those plain words of our Blessed Saviour, for fear of his appearing *Anti-Scriptural*, must needs have seen the same Evidence of the Creed for proving him *Anti-Catholic*. But this is what perhaps he slighted under the Notion of a Modern Sentiment; or rather, what he fear'd too much, being conscious that it was not to be exploded as an Eastern manner of Expression.

7. This was the first part of the Charge which I undertook in this Chapter to maintain. The second, on which I am to proceed, is this; viz. That what Mr. *Dodwel* has lately advanced concerning the Condition of Human Souls, is liable to some public Censures of the Church, by which the same, or like Opinions, have been already branded as Heretical. To this purpose, I shall urge the History of a very considerable Council, thus related by *Enschius*, (lib. 6.) under the Reign of the Emperor Philip. There was started up (says he) other
Innovators

Innovators in Arabia, who affirmed, that for the present, the Soul of Man dyes together with the Body, and shall revive again, with it, at the general Resurrection. But no small Council being then conven'd, Origen was invited thither; and he, in the name of all the rest, having undertook the Point in Question, so well behaved himself, that he brought the misled Persons to a Recantation of their Error. Mr. Dodwel could not omit the mention of this Council, in his Hypothesis so near a-kin to that Debate. Yet he passes over the Decision then given by the Church, as a thing not affecting his Opinion. Perhaps, because he supposes some Souls only to suffer Death, and not all, as those Arabians did; and because he makes those to dye some time before the last Judgment, not upon their Separation from the Body. But all that was mischievous in their Opinion was the very Principle, which, under another mask, is here brought again upon the Stage; viz. That the case of the Soul and Body (as our Writer with a more than usual clearness expresses himself, pag. 92.) is the same; That the Soul is naturally Mortal, as the Body is known to be; though, like the Body, it may be præternaturally invested with actual Immortality: But then, as the Body naturally dies for want

of

of a Soul to enliven it, so the Soul too (pag. 301.) may relapse to its natural Mortality for want of a Body to support it. This is what the Church oppos'd in this Council held against the *Arabians*. 'Twas against the Mortality of the Soul that *Origen* then disputed, and not against the Notion of its Resurrection. Their fanciful *Resurrection of the Soul* had the same weight in their *Hypothesis*, as Mr. *Dodwel's Baptismal Spirit* has in *his*. i. e. When the first Principle of their *Hypothesis* had shook the whole Fabrick of Religion, this was the sham Support by which they would prevent its falling. But instead of any Thanks to the Inventors of these *Salvo's*, the Church then receiv'd these, as well as their new Suppositions, with a just Disdain. Of this we have a very pertinent Instance in *Epiphanius*; when disputing against another sort of Heresy, (pag. 559.) he tells us that, *If any one is ever reduc'd to this, that he must own a Resurrection of the Soul, that Man has a very large share of Stolidity and Unreasonableness*. But then 'tis remarkable why this Opinion is charg'd with so much Stolidity, viz. because such an one, if he will speak plain and not prevaricate, must *ὁ τὸν θεὸν οὐκ ὁμολογῶν τὴν ψυχὴν* : i. e. He must have before defin'd, that the Soul is Mortal. Yet this

this which was antiently exploded as a more absurd consequence of a very absurd Opinion, is what Mr. *Dodwel* has now professedly reviv'd ; and (which still adds to the Paradox) has vented as a Tradition of Antiquity. But instead of servilely subscribing to him in this abusive Misrepresentation of the Churches Doctrines ; we may justly think him liable, not only to that Absurdity here expos'd by *Epiphanius*, but likewise to that Heresy of the *Arabians*, before recited by *Eusebius*. And of this he is himself so conscious, that he openly enters into the Lists with *Origen* : the Orthodoxy of whose Principles (in this particular) the Church then acknowledg'd for her own. To this purpose, he represents his Doctrine as very singular, (*pag. 100.*) in making all Human Souls equal in their Claim to Immortality. He taxes him with having magnify'd the Nature of Human Soul, beyond the Bounds of Truth and Catholic Tradition, (*pag. 61.*) and is so unlucky, as to call those his private Opinions, which History has expressly represented as the Sense of a whole Council. What is this, but to deal with the Church of the Third Century, as he does with that of the Seventeenth ? What is this, but to undervalue the Decisions of that *Synod*, while

while he condemns them in *Origen*, who was then their Oracle; and obstinately to incur those *Anathema's* which the *Arabians* avoided by a Recantation?

8. The natural Immortality of the Soul was a Principle so well guarded by this early Care of the Church, as well as by the concurrent Consent even of Heathenism it self, that 'tis no wonder, if we hear of no Innovations in this Point from the Third to the Thirteenth Century. But then we have another Instance of its being call'd in question by means of some Schemes of *Averroës*, that, about that time, began to be current in the World. This occasion'd a Bishop of *Paris* to declare it Heresy, by a Synodical Decree of his, if any one should presume to affirm that, Philosophically speaking, the Soul was Mortal. Mr. *Dodwel* who allows it no other Immortality, but by the sole Covenant of Grace, must fall expressly under that Censure. But because I too well know how disdainfully he will regard the Sentence of one single Bishop, I come now to confront him with the joint *Anathema* of a whole Ecumenical Council, deliver'd in the Year 1513, against the same pernicious Opinions, then vented under a pretence of Piety, by *Pomponatius* and his Party. The Industry with which they

they then spread their Notions, insinuating that the Gospel had indeed assur'd them of the Soul's Immortality ; but that it seem'd to have no such Claim from Principles of bare natural Reason, occasion'd this ample Determination in the Eighth Session of the last Lateran Council. *Cum itaq; diebus nostris, &c.* Whereas we cannot but with Grief observe, that the Sower of Tares, the old Enemy of Mankind, has in these our days spread several pernicious Errors, hitherto always detested by the Faithful ; some more particularly concerning the Nature of the Rational Soul, affirming it to be Mortal, &c. And whereas some rash Philosophizers pretend that this is true, at least upon Principles of Philosophy, we being desirous of employing all seasonable Remedies against so pestilent an Evil, do, with the Consent and Approbation of this Council, condemn and reject all those who shall affirm that the Intellectual Soul is Mortal. ——— And all who shall abet any such like Erroneous Assertions, we decree that they be punish'd, and abandon'd, as Sowers of most damnable Heresies, as most detestable Heretics and Infidels, and as Underminers of the Catholic Faith.

9. The Church of England was then a Branch of that Church which thunder'd out so severe a Sentence, and consequently
admits

admits of this, and all it ever decreed not contrary to the Word of God. But 'twas not long after, that upon a Reformation of Religion, it Establish'd its present separate Communion; and in the Year 1552, Publish'd a Body of Articles agreed upon by the Bishops, and other Learned and Godly Men in Convocation. Two of these that concern the Resurrection of the Dead, and the Condition of Human Souls, are eminently to our present purpose. (R. Edv. 6. Art. 39. & 40.) By the first of them the Church solemnly professes, *That (as Scripture doth most manifestly testifie) to All that be Dead, their own Bodies, Flesh and Bone, shall be restored.* By the second, *That they which affirm that the Souls die with the Bodies, and at the last Day shall be raised up with the same, do utterly dissent from the right Faith declared to us in Holy Scripture.* Now what can be a flatter Opposition to Mr. Dodwel's novel Opinions, than the express Letter of the former of these Articles; and than the plain Intention of the latter? I say, the Letter of the former; because as I before observ'd of *Creeeds*, so I here affirm of *Church Articles*, that they are not to be intrench'd upon by any Figurative Interpretations. And therefore the Phrase of *All that be Dead*, must stand in

its full force against him, who imagins any particular Body can be exempted from the General Resurrection. But I add likewise, the plain Intention of the latter Article : because it is not to be suppos'd, that this was calculated against those Men who hold that departing Souls shall rise together with their Bodies ; but those, who think that the Soul is capable of dying with the Body ; or rather, of dying as the Body dies. The Resurrection of the Soul is mention'd indeed by *this Convocation*, as it was before in that *Synod of Arabia* : yet not as any ingredient of the Heresy, but as the vain Refuge of those Men who had affirm'd it Mortal. In the mean time they condemn'd the Principle, and not the Salvo ; *i. e.* not disputing concerning the Resurrection of the Soul, they rejected its natural Mortality ; and the Heterodoxy of believing that it could cease for any space of time, much more that it could be extinguish'd for all Eternity. This Rule of Faith, thus deliver'd in two venerable Assemblies, must needs expose Mr. *Dodwel* to the Censure of the Primitive and of the Present Church. Nor can I forbear aggravating his Guilt yet farther by this following Observation : *viz.* That the Universality of the Resurrection, and the absolute Immortality of Human

Human Souls, were Doctrines so unlikely to be ever controverted, and already so well Establish'd by the Tenour of the three Creeds, that when in the Year 1562 a second Book of Articles was compiled, those two which I have above cited, were thought unnecessary to be added to it. All Intrenchment therefore upon the Universality of the Resurrection, and the Immortality of the Soul, is by this implied not only to be Heresy; but even a *monstrous, unlook'd for, unexpected Heresy*. It hereby seems to have an heinousness like that of *Parricide*: *i. e.* the less it has been prohibited the more criminal it appears; and being before condemned by the express Sentence of the First Book of Articles, it is now more amply and more solemnly condemn'd by the Silence of the Second.

10. Hitherto these Opinions have appeared Heretical, for their derogating from an Article which the Church has always taught, with no less Clearness than Authority: *viz. That no Flesh shall be exempted from the Resurrection of the Dead; no Souls from a Life of Happiness or Misery Everlasting.* I come now to charge an Heresy of another sort on the same Hypothesis, as it accounts for the duration of those Souls which it allows to be actually Immortal.

For no Christian Writer ever yet denied the absolute Immortality of the Soul, but he introduc'd at the same time another healing Principle to salve all the offensive Consequences of this Doctrine. Hence the *Arabians* before mention'd, who, with Mr. *Dodwel*, held the Soul to be a Principle naturally Mortal, were so consistent with themselves, as to suppose therefore that the Soul died together with the Body : but then they fell in again with the Scheme of Christianity, by affirming, that as the Soul died together with the Body, so together with the Body it should be rais'd likewise from the Dead. And in truth, by this means they entrench'd nothing upon the Universality of the Resurrection, or the Eternity of Rewards and Punishments. Now a Refuge parallel to what they sought in their fanciful Resurrection of the Soul, is that to which Mr. *Dodwel* has recourse in his *Immortalizing Baptismal Spirit*. This only Difference must be allow'd, that Mr. *Dodwel* is less consistent with himself; while, as he thinks, having very aptly join'd a Mortal Soul to a Mortal Body, he yet supposes the latter to subsist præternaturally, after their dissolution, till towards the approach of the General Judgment. And after all, he cannot, he does not himself
dissemble,

dissemble, that to imagine so many pretious Souls then relapsing into actual Mortality, must overthrow what is generally believ'd under the two last Articles of the Creed : *i. e. The Resurrection of the Dead, and the Life of the World to come.* The full Latitude therefore of these two is very freely given up : but he confides in his *Baptismal Spirit*, not only for confirming all other Articles of our Faith, but for the clearing of many knotty Difficulties, which till he appear'd on this Stage, had, he thinks, encumbred Christianity. But this very Boast is it self a rank presumption of his being big with Heresy ; and even in Points less authentically determin'd, than by the Tradition and Authority of a Church, would be interpreted to be a Gaping beyond all Decency, to make a Promise beyond all his Strength. Yet these are those Reflections which I remit to the Conclusion of this Discourse, while at present I strictly hold him to an Examination of those Violences which he has offer'd to the Church.

II. His Notion therefore of an *Immortalizing Baptismal Spirit*, as by him it is appropriated to one sort of Men, but denied to others, *i. e.* as it is made the privilege of his sole Communion, but is

withheld from the whole Christian World besides, is what I here accuse as a new sort of Heresy, appendant to that other which I before alleg'd. For hereby he directly revives that troublesom old Question concerning the Validity of Christian Baptism in any separate Communion. Nor does he only revive the Question, but he professes to espouse that side of it which the Church has most peremptorily declar'd Heretical. Before such a Declaration had taken place, 'twas no more than an Human Error in *St. Cyprian* and *Firmilian*, to contend for the nullity of all Baptism that was administred by Separatists of any sort. But since this Opinion was soon condemn'd by the Councils of *Arles* and *Carthage*; since by the Eighth Canon of the first General Council, the *Novatian* Baptism was esteem'd an admission to all the Privileges of Christianity; since lastly, this Question was afterwards unanswerably clear'd and settled by the successful labours of *St. Austin*, and the whole World has thereupon consented, that Christian Baptism wants none of its effects, wheresoever it shall be administred in the name of the Blessed Trinity; this Controversy can never be reassumed again without an Imputation of the rashest and grossest Heresy. Yet this is now the bold
and

and flagrant Attempt of Mr. *Dodwel* : who maintains, that the Baptism of his Communion is the only true Admittance to the Hopes and Privileges of Christianity; but that the Baptism of all out of that *Pale* can give only a greater possibility of Damnation. This were now open Heresy, if in his Dispute with the Church of *England*, he were indeed in the place of *St. Cyprian*, or *St. Austin*. But as on the other side, his Case is undoubtedly that of *Novatianism*, and the Party of *Donatus*; he is to be charg'd with having added Impudence to his Heresy; and justly falls under the Chastisement of that Learned Father, whom (*pag. 302.*) he so freely taxes as inconsiderate. *Audent etiam rebaptizare Catholicos : ubi se amplius Hereticos esse firmarunt : cum Ecclesie Catholice Universae placuerit, nec in ipsis Hereticis Baptisma commune rescindere,* (says *St. Austin* *Heres. 69.*) i. e. These Donatists are so impudent as to Rebaptize the Members of the Church : in which they give a yet fuller Evidence of their Heresy : since it has been the Pleasure of the Universal Catholic Church, not to invalidate our common Baptism, even when administred by those who are Heretics.

12. In the mean time let him not imagine that we derogate from any thing that

he can say, to extol the Vertue of Christian Baptism : let him enlarge as magnificently as he is able on that Subject : we will reply to him with *Optatus, Quid magis pro nobis & nostrum est ?* (Lib. 1.) i. e. *What could he have said more to our Advantage ? Bene laudasti Baptisma : quis enim fidelium nesciat singulare Baptisma virtutum esse viam, criminum Mortem, nativitatem Immortalem ?* (Lib. 5.) We gladly fall in with him on these Topics, and allow our Baptism to be indeed a *Birth to Immortality*. An Expression this, which sounds more in favour of his Hypothesis, than all that other shew of Words which he rakes out of the Good Fathers in his Defence. But S. *Optatus* was indeed an unhallow'd Author, and could by no means be call'd into this Controversy. For that were to have reminded the Reader of a Book, which in every Line is a flat Rebuke to his Pretences ; and which changing the bare Circumstances of Name, and Time, and Place, may be read against Mr. *Dodwel* instead of *Parmenian*. To give a small relish of this, I will not here quote to him that Language of his *Parænesis*, (a) *Quid est Imperatori cum Ecclesiâ ?* Nor will I answer the

(a) De Schism. Donatist. lib. 3. Paræn. §. 51. & 52.

the same Taunt with that Observation so proper to the Constitution of our Church and State, (a) *Non Respublica est in Ecclesiâ, sed Ecclesia in Republicâ est.* I will not remind him by these following Expressions of the Groundless Occasion of his Schism : (a) *Merito Paulus docet orandum esse pro Regibus, & Potestatibus ; etiamsi talis Imperator esset, qui gentiliter viveret : quanto quod Christianus, quanto quod Deum timens, quanto quod Religiosus, quanto quod Misericors, ut ipsa res probat !* I will not lastly compare that staunch Practice of his, in Unchurching almost the whole Christian World, with the same Attempt thus derided by our Author in the *Donatists* : (b) *Ecclesiam, Tu, Frater Parmeniane, quare apud vos solos esse dixisti ; nisi forte quia vobis specialem sanctitatem de superbâ vindicare contenditis : ut ubi vultis, ibi sit Ecclesia ; & non sit, ubi non vultis ? Ergo ut in particulâ Africæ, in angulo parvæ regionis apud vos esse possit ; apud nos, in aliâ Africæ parte, non erit ? In Hispaniis, in Galliâ, in Italiâ, ubi vos non estis, non erit ?* These Passages, I say, I will omit : because I am now giving the Picture of his Heresy, rather than of his Schism. But that, I think, is here drawn to the Life, in this following

ing Expostulation : *Spem amputans futurorum, totum in presenti tempore posuisti, dicendo, a societate vestra projectum esse eum, qui Janitores & ministros fefellerit vestros, ut a communione fidelium foras cum injuria mitteretur.* (Lib. 5.) i. e. Cutting off from other Men all hopes of a Futurity, you allow 'em the bare Privilege of a short Temporary Condition ; pretending that your Society refuses all, who are not admitted by your own Officers, and so dismisses 'em with Disgrace from the Communion of the Faithful.

13. Were it not natural to all Persons, who have long harbour'd an ill scent, to be themselves insensible of the Nuisance, while 'tis offensive to all about 'em ; Mr. *Dodwel*, who is too well acquainted with this parallel, must needs have thought that his own Case smells rank of *Donatism*. But waving here the Question of the Schism, The Charge of Heresy, in his thus invalidating the Baptism of this and other Churches, is unanswerable. He cannot pretend that any one Father, since the time of *St. Cyprian*, ever acknowledg'd an effectual difference betwixt the Baptism of Catholics and Schismatics : much less did any ever dream of the one actually Immortalizing the Soul to Happiness, and the other only subjecting it to a nearer capacity of

Dam-

Damnation. On the contrary, 'tis the Sentence not of one or of many Fathers, but of the whole Church in Council, that all Baptism, in the Name of the Holy Trinity, is a valid Baptism. Making no difference in this Point as to the right or wrong of the Separation, 'twas Heresy even in a Member of the Church to except against the Baptism of the Party. For while the Mad-ness of the *Donatists* and *Novatians* expos'd our Christian Baptism at all adventures, the better to support their Claim of administering it; the Church on the other hand, was so tender of its Nature, that they rather allow'd it to those Schismatics, than they would suffer it to be torn in pieces: And thus, like the Mother in the Court of *Solomon*, she gave an indubitable Proof of her truer relation to that Sacrament.

14. Thus far have I now gone in the second part of that Charge, which I undertook in this Chapter to maintain: and have shewn that what Mr. *Dodwel* has lately advanc'd, concerning the Condition of Human Souls, is liable to some declar'd Sentences of the Church, by which these, or the like Opinions, have been already branded as Heretical. And now methinks, so many flat Oppositions to Creeds and Canons need only a proper Denomination, under

under which they may take their place in the List of Heresies. Mr. *Dodwel*, I confess, who so industriously dissembles his Authority for these novel Thoughts, seems ambitious of their being propagated under his own Name. But I am sorry that we are here forc'd to deprive him even of that sordid Satisfaction. For I shall now discover to the World whose servile Disciple he has made himself; and shall find him out a Master well renown'd in Heresy. However he may fall short of his Pretences in proving that the Soul of Man is Mortal; he has given us a very convincing Evidence, that Opinions are not so. For this rare Hypothesis of his, now drest under the fine colours of Scripture and Tradition, is nothing but the Resurrection of a *Phœnix* presented to the World about an Age ago, by one who was no great favourer of Scripture or Traditions, the disturber of *Poland*, and of all *Christendom*, *Faustus Socinus* by name. Before I come therefore in the next Chapter to those Fathers of the three first Centuries, which with great Boast Mr. *Dodwel* brings to his Defence; I shall here strengthen his Opinion by a Father of the Sixteenth Century, of whom he seems not to be so proud. Instead of Scraps and Shadows of Authority

rity brought from those *Antient Fathers*,
 Witnesses which he is fain to torture before
 they can speak his Meaning, I shall here
 oblige him with the full and ample Con-
 currence of his *Modern Father*. A Father,
 I mean, not of the Church; but which is
 much more to our present purpose, the
 Father of this very Opinion. A Father,
 who discovers his undoubted relation by so
 happy a resemblance, not of Thoughts on-
 ly, but Expressions, that the Learned Mr.
Dodwel must at length resign the Offspring;
 and must be contented, instead of Author,
 to be call'd the Plagiary of his own Hypo-
 thesis.

15. The Proof of all this will be a very
 proper Conclusion of this Chapter, in
 which I have laid so much Heresy to Mr.
Dodwel's Charge. And therefore I now
 present the following Particulars as so ma-
 ny Parallels betwixt Him and *Socinus*; and
 as a Scheme of their conspiring very for-
 tunately, not only in the natural Mortality
 of the Soul in general, but (to use Mr.
Dodwel's own most Illogical Expression)
 even in the actual Mortality of some par-
 ticular Souls.

16. I. In the first place therefore we are to
 observe, that Mr. *Dodwel* has now wrote
 a Book, (by way of Debate with an un-
 known

known Friend of his) in which to prove, that Man is a Being Mortal in all senses, he maintains, that the two parts of his Constitution, *i. e.* his Soul as well as Body, have no pretence to Immortality by virtue of their Creation; but yet that both of them are capable, by the Grace of God, of being actually Immortaliz'd. (See §. 24. & 60.) *Socinus* about an Hundred Years

* *Bibl. Polon. Tom. 2.*
pag. 258.

before, wrote likewise a

* Book (by way of Controversy with *Franciscus*

Puccius) in which he maintains the Mortality of Man in the very same Tenour, and upon the self-same Principles. But because *Socinus* was a Man of more Modesty than *some others*, and because that was not an Age, so ripe as the present is, in Paradox and Innovation; He therefore kept himself upon the reserve, in his public Debate, as to the Question of the Soul's Immortality. But we have a very frank Confession of his whole Thought and Design in that Subject, preserv'd to us in a private

* *Bibl. Polon. Tom. 1.*
pag. 454.

* Letter to a Friend of his own Stamp: directed, *Ad*

Joannem Wolkelium Philippoviam, in Lithuaniam; and dated, *Cracoviae, 16. Novembris, Anno 1596.* There speaking of his Book call'd *Disputatio adversus*

versus Puccium, Spero ejus Editionem (says he) non diu dilatum iri. Velim autem scias me duplici de causa . . . ab ista questione de animæ Immortalitate ibi abstinnisse. Nam & mihi res erat cum homine qui me calumniandi, inq; omnium invidiam vocandi, omnem occasionem quærebat : nec dum mihi quid de questione ista statuendum sit, plenè explicatum erat ; quemadmodum nec hodie quidem est. Tantum id mihi videtur statui posse : post hanc vitam, animam sive animum Hominis non ita per se subsistere, ut præmia ulla pænæve sentiat, vel etiam ista sentiendi sit capax. Quæ mea firma Opinio facile potest ex disputatione istâ colligi, cum ex multis quæ indentidem a me ibi dicuntur, tum vero ex ipsa, de quâ præcipue agitur, sententiâ meâ. Nam quamvis, cum ipso Puccio disputans, qui ut Immortalitatem primi Hominis ante peccatum probaret, animæ ipsius Immortalitatem mihi objiciebat, ostendi non propterea Hominem dici Immortalem quia anima ipsius non moriatur : Tamen satis apparet me sentire, non ita vivere post Hominis mortem, animam ejus, ut per se præmiorum pænarumve capax existat, cum in ipso primo Homine totius Immortalitatis rationem uni Gratiæ Dei tribuo, nec in ipsa creatione quidquam Immortalis Vitæ in Homine agnosco.

There needs nothing to represent to all the
World

World the justness of this Parallel, betwixt what Mr. *Dodwel* and *Socinus* have advanc'd, concerning the natural Mortality of Man in Soul as well as Body ; but a bare Translation of the Passage. Yet this is a Pains which other Readers will excuse me, when they consider to whom this Treatise is address'd. But,

17. II. Mr. *Dodwel*, who is thus positive as to the natural Mortality of the Soul in general, yet leaves no particular Souls liable to actual Death, or (as he oddly phrases it) to actual Mortality, if while living in this World, they were by any means made acquainted with the Terms of Christianity. But as for all others, *i. e.* all who were or are strictly Heathen, he freely owns that they shall be so many Exceptions to the two last Articles of the Creed : *i. e.* *The Resurrection of the Body, and the Life Everlasting.* *Socinus*, who before conspir'd with Mr. *Dodwel* as to the natural Mortality of the Soul, goes on with him in his Notion of Christians being to be actually Immortaliz'd ; But of the *Impii*, as he calls them, *i. e.* the whole Heathen World, being liable to actual Death. For Proof of this, consult we first that state of his Opinion, as represented to him by *Puccius* in the *Proëm* of his Defence. *Non me latet te etiam negare*
Im-

Immortalitatem animarum, nisi Christianorum, in Resurrectione. How truly this was Socinus's Opinion, is plain from his own Reply to that Accusation ; in which he denies it not, but tells Puccius only, that *He* particularly had no Reason to charge him with such a Thought. But to us it is now much plainer, who have read his fair Confession in the Letter before cited. And to put it beyond all Question, that he not only thus led the dance to Mr. Dodwel, but that he was conscious too of his intrenching thereby upon the receiv'd Faith of the Church, concerning the Universality of the Resurrection, and the Everlasting Life that was to follow it, let us look into his next Letter to *Wolkelius*, dated *Cracoviae, die 8. Martii, 1597.* *Nam quod ais, ea ibi (in Disputatione cum Puccio) tum de Christianorum Resurrectione, tum de morte impiorum passim contineri ; quæ a multis sine magna offensione, tum nostris, tum alienis legi non possint ; scio equidem ista ibi contineri ; sed meo judicio nec passim, nec ita apertè (cavi enim istud quantum potui) ut quisquam Vir pius facile offendi possit.* We find indeed some difference in this Parallel : But to Mr. Dodwel's greater Condemnation, 'tis a difference not of the Opinions, but of the Men. For Socinus,

F

we

we see, was truly sensible that this was too scandalous to be public; and was therefore wary (as Mr. *Dodwel* has not been) how he gave so great Offence either to the Church, or to his own Party.

18. III. Mr. *Dodwel* being likewise toucht in one part of his Discourse with a Qualm concerning the Offensiveness, and the harsh Consequences of his Doctrine, undertakes to salve all that by a renown'd piece of Subtilty, which I shall transcribe at large. *It is not possible that any one now can hear of the Doctrine I am speaking of without hearing of the Gospel too: because it is urg'd as the Doctrine of the Gospel. This being so, there will follow this, I think, unavoidable Dilemma. They who never heard of this Doctrine cannot possibly make any ill use of it: and they who do hear of it, must also hear of the Gospel: and therefore cannot promise themselves any Security, if they still continue refractory. (§. 24.)* (He means any Security on occasion of what *Socinus* calls the *Mors impiorum*; and He the actual Mortality of Souls unacquainted with the Gospel.) This is indeed a Curiosity worthy of the *Socinian Library*: a Subtilty which I should have look'd for in that School of Subtilty. But to save our farther Pains, see how it here follows very
luckily

luckily in Socinus's last worthy Letter. *Quod nominatim attinet ad impiorum Mortem, in quo dogmate majus est multo offensionis periculum ; ea potius ex iis colligi possit quæ ibi disputantur, quam expresse literis consignata extet. Adeo ut lector, qui aliqui sententiam meam adversus Puccium de Mortalitate primi Hominis, (quæ toto libro agitur, quæq; ob non paucos quos habet fautores parum aut nihil offensionis parere potest) probandam censeat; prius sentiat doctrinam istam (i. e. de Morte impiorum) sibi jam persuasam esse, quam suaderi animadvertat. i. e. As Mr. Dodwel goes on with this Subtilty of his Master, (at the end of §. 24.) Where is the Danger, where is the Abuse, that can be made of this Doctrine (concerning the Mortality of the Soul) by them that hear it, and impartially consider it ? A rare Conccit of two noble Dogmatizers! who, it seems, believe their Hypothesis to be a meer Trap ; into which, if any one will pop his Ears, it must needs catch him by the Understanding. But at last to convict Mr. Dodwel from what Quiver he borrow'd this Arrow, they both conclude this very Device with a defiance of the Consequences that may be chargeable on their Doctrines : viz. Mr. Dodwel in these words ; No rational Person will make*

any (Writer) responsible for Consequences he believes irrational. But Socinus in words much a-kin to those ; *Quicquid sit, veritas patefacienda est : nec oportuisset ullum ferme hæcenus ex meis scriptis publicare, si legentium offensio cavenda fuisset.* This Parallel will, I think, discover to the World, in what steps Mr. Dodwel treads : to say nothing of the ὁμιλον, or disguise, which is here common to him, and to his great Master. His Master having taught the Mortality of the Soul under the Covert-Title of *Mortalitas primi Hominis* ; and Mr. Dodwel now teaching the same, under that which he calls the *Distinction between Soul and Spirit.*

19. IV. After this, Mr. Dodwel's Hypothesis begins to open ; and, of the Souls which are actually to be Immortaliz'd, he tells us, that some are to be Immortaliz'd to Happiness, and others Immortaliz'd to Punishment. Terms that are indeed uncouth and unusual enough ; yet are they not here introduced without the same great Authority on which he hitherto has depended : for they are the very Notion of Socinus, express'd by *Vivificatio ad Salutem*, and *Vivificatio ad Perditionem.* (Tom. 1. p. 359.) But as he proceeds to his main Design, *i. e.* the Disposal of Human Souls ;
some

some of which he allots, by means of a True Episcopal Baptism, to a blessed Immortality ; and dooms others, by the bare Pleasure of God, to Eternal Damnation ; Here, at length, Mr. *Dodwel* is deserted by his Master. For *Socinus* never much concern'd himself with the Vertue of *Water-Baptism* ; nor was he much addicted to call in the Pleasure of Almighty God to damn those who dissented from his Communion. While therefore our Author is thus left to his own Invention, there appears a palpable incongruity in his Hypothesis : there being no parity betwixt a Baptismal Spirit Immortalizing some Souls, and the bare Pleasure of God Immortalizing others. Besides that, the Pleasure of God is a wide Term ; and as he himself confesses, could not be imploy'd, without a sufficient promulgation of that Pleasure, to so harsh a purpose as the Damnation of any Creature. To solve therefore so great a difficulty, he has found out that this Pleasure of God was then punctually promulg'd, when by our Blessed Saviour the Devil was proclaim'd a public Enemy. Now this proclamation against the Devil, for which he quotes St. *Matth.* (12. 30.) and St. *Mark* (16. 16.) as peremptorily as if those Evangelists had register'd the ori-

ginal Ban, by which Satan was depos'd, is one of those Six Hundred Paradoxes, which I will not have the trouble of disputing with him. Yet who doubts but that the Devil is that old Serpent, which God had sufficiently proclaim'd an Enemy in the History of the Fall ; there not only cursing him, but entailing a perpetual * Enmity betwixt Him and Mankind, and threatning to *bruise his Head by the Womans Seed* ? (*Gen. 3. 15.*) But to refute this, or any other of his fanciful Discoveries, is, I say, a Penance which I will not impose upon my self. My Design only in this place is to prove, that this is no discovery of his own : and that though he alleges *St. Matthew* for a proclamation of this new War against the Devil, adding *St. Mark* as fuller than *St. Matthew* in that particular, (*Prem. p. 34.*) yet his true Evangelists for these great Tidings were none but *Socinus* and *Crellius* : *Socinus* more obscurely, but *Crellius* the fuller of the two. *Socinus* had given the hint, (*Tom. 2. pag. 26.*) when he tells us of the Death of those who do *stare a Diabolo*, and *favere partibus Diaboli* : i. e. in Mr. *Dodwel's* Language, *who join themselves to the Devil's Party.* (*Prem. §. 4*) But *Crellius* and Mr. *Dodwel* carry on the Notion, in words very parallel to

* Πόλεμον συνεΐξας. *Jos. Ant. lib. 1. c. 1.*

one another. Mr. Dodwel tells us (*Prem.* p. 41.) that from the very beginning of the Gospel, the Devil has been proclaim'd as a public Enemy: But Crellius, (*Bibl. Polon. Tom. 3. p. 509.*) *Satanæ ergo supplicium* (*Judicium & Damnatio* are the words he before uses) *ab eo jam tempore incepit, cum Christus salutarem Veritatis lucem intulit, & Homines ex Satanæ potestate eripere incepit.* Yet the true original promulgation of this Law, I take (says Mr. Dodwel, *Prem.* p. 34.) to have been from those words of our Saviour, enjoining the Promulgation of his Gospel: Go ye into all the World, &c. Crellius therefore proceeds, *Sed imprimis tunc cum legatos suos per universum terrarum Orbem emisit, eosq; tantâ instruxit Virtute ut arcem Satanæ invadere, eumq; undiq; pellere possent, &c.*— And in another part of his Works; *Tunc temporis videtur Deus per Christum traduxisse palam Satanam, postquam præcones Evangelii in universum Orbem dimisit, &c.* (*Oper. Exeg. Tom. 2. Fol. 286.*) See here the sordid Storehouse from whence this Gentleman arms against the Church; and where he picks up all his poyson'd Weapons, in order to slay the souls that should not dye.

20. V. The Passages in St. Matthew and St. Mark, here strain'd by Mr. Dodwel to

this strange declaration of War against the Devil, were expressly suggested to him by *Socinus* and *Crellius*. But I proceed farther in this Fifth Parallel to observe, that he is in general a faithful Copier after those Masters, in explication of Holy Scripture: insomuch that whenever he alleges or refutes any Scriptural Authority, that may fall in with this Dispute, he differs from them in nothing else but the bare clearness of their Expression. Even that darling Notion, that broken Reed on which he leans so desperately in almost every Paragraph of his Hypothesis, his misinterpretation, I mean, of the *πνεῦν ζωῆς* (*Gen. 2. 7.*) is borrow'd both in Word and Thought from *Socinus's* above-mention'd Treatise concerning *Man's natural Mortality*: and this no otherwise disguis'd, than as Mr. *Dodwel* calls that *Pnoë* and *Flatus*, which *Socinus*, according to the Vulgar Translation, calls *Spiraculum Vitæ*. (*Vid. Tom. 2. pag. 259. & 289.*) Those other Scriptural Expressions of *σῶμα ψυχῆς* & *πνεῦμα ζωοποιόν*, as by him they are often abus'd to prove a natural Mortality, are employ'd to the same purpose by *Socinus* and *Crellius*: By *Socinus*, in the place above quoted, and by *Crellius*, in his Comment on the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*. His Notion of

two Spirits in Man, *i. e.* an *Anima* and an *Animus*, (§. 50.) and his explication how these return to God, from *Eccles.* 12. 7. (*Præm. pag.* 24.) is only more intelligibly express'd by *Socinus*, (*pag.* 283.) But most notorious is the violence, which by their Example, he has done to that plain Doctrine of *St. Paul*, (*1 Cor.* 15. 22.) *As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive.* To invalidate what this Text implies concerning the Universality of the Resurrection; he tells us, (§. 31.) that *in truth the concern of the Dispute was not here, whether all Men simply, but whether they, who were in Christ should rise? i. e.* in the words of *Socinus*, (*pag.* 263.) *Quod ex hoc Pauli loco colligi posse credis, omnia corpora restitui debere; illud tibi affirmo, in hoc loco non de aliis hominibus agi quam Christianis.* In a word, his employing so many Pages (§. 32.) to compare the above-mention'd Text with *Rom.* 5. 15, 18. till with *Socinus* he construes *omnes* by *multi*, and with *Crellius*, *omnes* by *partim omnes*, is what I shall shew in its proper place to be a bold Heretical mangling of the Holy Scriptures; and that by Rules which he has servilely accepted under * two ve-

* Here compare the Epist. Discourse from p. 122. to p. 134. with *Socinus's* Reply to *Puccius* from p. 358. to p. 368. and with *Crellius* on *1 Cor.* 15. 22.

ry austere and domineering Masters.

21. VI. *Socinus* in his Dispute with *Puccius*, was chiefly concern'd to prove, that the first Man was created Mortal : *i. e.* of such a Body, as by the Laws of its own Nature, and abstracting from the ill Consequences of the Fall, was liable to suffer Dissolution. By this he was insensibly led, though not without a due degree of shame, into that which Mr. *Dodwel* now maintains, concerning the natural Mortality of the Soul. Mr. *Dodwel*, on the other side, having asserted the natural Mortality of the Soul, has run with greater freedom into the Opinion of *Socinus*, concerning the natural Mortality of the Body. For it being once granted that the Body, *i. e.* one constituent part of Man, was created Mortal, he thought for meer congruity sake, he might assume that the Soul, *i. e.* the other constituent, was created Mortal too. Upon this view, (§. 60.) he tells us, and that with a very unbecoming Confidence, *It is most certain, that our Bodies were at first created Mortal.* Rare Opinions indeed, beyond all that was ever advanc'd by (a)

(a) *Apud Horat. lib. 2. Sat. 4.*

*Ipsa memor praecepta canam,
celabitur auctor.*

Plato and *Pythagoras*. Yet, for reasons best known to himself and (a) *Catius*, Mr. *Dodwel* is resolved to conceal

conceal his Author. He goes on therefore with an Argument, that some may think his own : (b) *There had*

otherwise (says he) been no need, nor use of the differences of Sex. — *The use of them is only*

to preserve the Species, when the Individuals cannot be preserved. But the Argument, as well as Opinion, is copied from his Master : (b) *Quis unquam Immortalem . . . naturam illius esse audebit dicere, qui commi-*

(b) *Mr. Dodwel, P. 299. Socinus, P. 262.*

ssione cum altero suæ speciei sibi similem gignat, & ejusmodi generationi destinatus sit, ut fuit homo antequam delinqueret ?

Quis non videt sibi similis productionem ad speciei conservationem pertinere, intereuntibus individuis ? Least this should not be persuasive, he obliges us with a second Argument : (b) *Nor had there otherwise, says he, been any use of the Tree of Life, to make them Immortal, if even their Bodies had been Immortal naturally. i e. In the words like-*

wise of Socinus : (b) Quibus addatur, hominem si immortalis creatus esset, esu arboris illius vitalis ab initio opus non habiturum fuisse. But though Pelagius as well as Socinus, do indeed support him in these Opinions, I must still tax him with an unbecoming Confidence, for ushering in his Heresies with the same attestation of Certain-

ty

ty, that the Church usually gives to Articles of Faith. *It is most certain*, (says he) *that our Bodies were at first created Mortal.* But if τὰ ἀρχαῖα κελίστω were not a Rule now forgotten, or slighted by him; that positiveness might, methinks, have been a little check'd by the Authority of some Coun-

* See the Councils of Mileve and Carthage, An. 417.

cils, who have given us this * repeated Canon against the Heresy of *Pelagius* and *Celestius*; ὅτι Ἀδὰμ θνητὸς ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκρίνετο. *That Adam was not by God created Mortal.* (Cod. Can. Afr. c. 109.) Such is the Title of that Canon; not a little contradictory, it seems, to what was before impos'd upon us by *Socinus* and *Mr. Dodwel*. But the Canon it self deserves being describ'd at large: — ὅστις λέγῃ ὅτι Ἀδὰμ ὁ πρωτόπλαστον ἄνθρωπον θνητὸν γενομένον ἔπῳ, ὡς ἔτε ἀμαρτήσῃ ἔτε μὴ ἀμαρτήσῃ, τεθνηξόμενον ἐν τῷ σώματι, ἵπτεσιν ἐξελεῖν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος, μὴ τῇ αἰτίᾳ τῇ ἀμαρτίας, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἀνάγκῃ τῇ φύσει, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. i. e. *Whosoever shall affirm that Adam, the first-form'd Man, was created Mortal by God, so that, whether he should sin, or whether he should not sin, he was to die in the Body; i. e. to depart out of the Body, not by any consequence of his sin, but by the necessity of his Nature, Let him be accursed.* Where now is the Modesty, not to say the Orthodoxy, of that Man,

Man, who can thus fall in with *Pelagius*, and can make himself not only the Scholar, but even the Plagiary of *Socinus*, in scorn of these plain Decisions and Anathemas of the Church?

22. VII. If this continued Parallel is not a sufficient detection, in whose Service Mr. *Dodwel* is now listed; he may please to know that I am able, tho' I am not at leisure, to carry on the comparison in other very notorious Instances. I could observe particularly, with whom he agrees in those Concessions he sometimes makes in honour of Human Souls; and with whom it is that he derogates as much from them, by supposing that they cannot be supported without a Body; nor be perpetuated, but by some new Spirit that is adventitious to their Nature. For Instance, (*Prem. pag. 22.*) he tells us, *That there is in the Soul of Man, by means of the Flatus, a Title, in some sense, to a divine Offspring.* (Pag. 159.) *That St. Paul therefore, in Acts 17. approves the Expression of Aratus to that purpose.* (Page 300.) *That this Flatus was to qualifie the Soul for that supernatural Principle of the higher Spirit, by union with which, Man was to hope for Immortality; but* (Pag. 301.) *that the Soul being left by this Flatus, (or, as he there calls it, this lower Spirit) must*
needs

needs relapse to the Mortality that was natural to it, when it had now no Body to support it. Now before any impartial Judge this must needs discover an affinity to the following Hypothesis, which I have transcrib'd not from one single Heretic, but from the whole Socinian Tribe. For tho' they here confess with Mr. Dodwel, that the Soul is in some sense divine; yet, with him too, they deny it any Principle of Immortality, unless by Union with a certain new adscititious Spirit. *Hinc apparet* (say they) *animabus hominum (quamvis per se subsistentes imperfectæ sint, & organo demum aliquo sibi adjuncto quasi perficiantur) propter illam tamen divini Luminis quam in intellectu & voluntate suâ continent, auram & essentiam, aliquid divini inesse, ut non sine causa Homines divinum Genus a Paulo Act. 17. dicantur.* But it follows; — *Ostensum est igitur animos seu spiritus humanos substantias esse quidem spirituales, sed complemento organi sui indigentes. Quod si corporeum sit ac terrenum, Animam efficit aliquamdiu viventem, quæ inter substantias cælesti naturâ præditas, poni non meretur. — Sin istud complementum & organum sit spirituale, ideoq; spiritui nostro homogeneum, spiritum efficit seipsum in perpetuum vivificantem, & plane cælesti naturâ præditum* (Hyperspist.

peraspist. *Eccl. Pol. cap. 5.*) From hence, and from other Passages of that Work, too tedious to be here inserted, 'tis evident that Mr. *Dodwel*, and this whole Heresy, jointly teach the Mortality of the Soul, as it first actuates Human Body. But they both allow on the other side, that it may at length be Immortaliz'd by the accession of a superior Spirit; receiv'd, as Mr. *Dodwel* says, at the time of regular Baptism; as They, at the time of Resurrection.

23. But I am here contented to lay aside so gross a Parallel; presuming that I have now answer'd the Title of this Chapter; in which I undertook *to prove a Charge of Heresy against these Opinions of Mr. Dodwel, as being contrary to the receiv'd Doctrine of the Church.* To this purpose I have impleaded his *Hypothesis* of subjecting to an actual, irreversible Death, as well in Soul as Body, the far greatest part of those who were ever yet created: Whereas the Church, in many authentic Creeds, has set its Seal to the indispensable Resurrection, and the everlasting continuance of all Mankind. Particularly I have urg'd its opposition to the express Letter of a most antient Creed, handed to St. *Irenaeus* from the Apostles: To a Creed preserv'd by *Tertullian*, very ample in both those Articles:

cles : To the Creeds of *Africa*, *Jerusalem*, and *Constantinople* more especially, in the Article of a Life to come : To an authentic Comment of *Ruffinus* on the first public Copy of the *Apostles Creed* : But most notoriously, to the full and careful expression of the *Athanasian Creed* ; in which, from a parallel passage of Holy Scripture, we profess to believe an absolute Resurrection of *all* Men in their own Bodies, and a consignment of them *all*, both in Soul and Body, to Happiness or Misery everlasting. And though the great Authority of these Creeds had for the most part secur'd an Orthodoxy concerning the perpetuity of all Mankind ; yet when ever there has been any Innovations on this Head, I have shewn that the Church has exerted it self against them in such terms, as have condemn'd, together with them, this *Hypothesis* of Mr. *Dodwel*. Thus for Instance has he fall'n under the Censure of *Origen*, and that *Council* which, in the *Arabian Heresy*, oppos'd the Mortality of the Soul ; of the Church of *England*, which by two Articles in the time of *R. Edw. 6.* rejected the like Principle ; and of the Fifth *Lateran Council*, which Anathematizes all those who pretend that at least, Philosophically speaking, the Soul appears to be Mortal. But

as

as if his denying the Soul to be an Immortal Substance had not been Heresy enough, I have shewn that his manner of accounting for the Immortality of some particular Souls is altogether as Heretical. For this he pretends to be the sole Privilege of Baptism; and this not of all Baptism, but the sole Baptism of his Communion; and so he enters into a perverse Contest with the whole Church; which in the Council of Nice gave an Instance of its allowing even a Schismatical Baptism; and in the Councils of *Arles*, and *Carthage*, declar'd it rank Heresy to do otherwise. To aggravate this Charge, I have farther shewn his forwardness, in even wandring from his own Subject, into the Principles of *Pelagius*; and there flatly contradicting the Church, concerning the Condition in which God created the First Man. At length, in defence of these rare Opinions, I have shewn how greedily he has lick'd up the Spittle of *Socinus*: till it embolden'd him to assert the natural Mortality of the Soul in an express and pompous Treatise: Whereas *Socinus*, who really taught the same, yet disguis'd it out of meer Modesty, and never vented it any otherwise, than in confidence, to his private Friends.

24. *Quid ad hæc dicturi estis, qui Schisma,*
G
usurpato

*nsurpato Ecclesiae nomine, & corruptè nutritis,
& impudenter defenditis ? **

* Optat lib. 1. c. 21.

—— *Arabianism, Donatism,
Pelagianism, Socinianism*, all spread, more
or less, over one thin Hypothesis, looks,
undoubtedly, like a *Contagion of Heresy*.
And by how just a Providence is this now
fall'n upon that Man, who affects to talk
so much of a *Contagious Schism* in the
whole sacred Body of the Church !

C H A P. III.

Continuing the same Charge of Heresy against this Epistolary Discourse, as contrary to the Tradition of the First Fathers : With an Aggravation of this Charge by Mr. Dodwel's injuriously misrepresenting their Opinions, in favour of what he advances concerning the Soul's Natural Mortality.

THUS far have I been engag'd in delivering some stated Opinions of the Church, concerning the Condition of the Soul. Yet this not Historically ; for that were a needless, as well as an endless work ; especially since our Adversary himself confesses, that for almost Fourteen Centuries, they have run in a full stream against him. But I have confin'd my self to the confronting of this Hypothesis with the Verdict of several *Creeeds* and Synodical Decrees ; Instruments, which have the Nature and Authority of Laws ; so sacred, that whatsoever Opinions shall be offer'd against them, are for that Reason declar'd Heretical ; and whosoever shall afterwards obstinately espouse such Opinions, is to be deem'd something more than Heretic. We are now farther to consider, that the great-

est part of what I have before urg'd, falls within the Verge of the four first Centuries ; and adds therefore the Credit of Antiquity, to the particular Authority which it brings. But because the purest Antiquity is pompously pleaded by Mr. *Dodwel* in his Defence, I come now therefore to put the Cause more expresly upon that Tryal ; and following him in his own steps, hope not only to invalidate, but even to turn against him every Antient Testimony to which he has appeal'd. The Reader, in the mean time, will undoubtedly accompany me in the same Pious Presumption : and instead of supposing that the Church has so long dissented from it self, concerning the Immortality of the Soul, will rather expect that Shame to fall on Mr. *Dodwel's* Head. But that this may be prov'd, as well as said ; I shall endeavour to make good what is promis'd in this Chapter, after the following manner. *First*, Since Mr. *Dodwel* has begun his Plea from Antiquity, with a Pretence that several *Hellenist* and *Platonic Jews*, had prescrib'd to the following Writers of the Church, in Terms and Notions very favourable to the Soul's natural Mortality ; I shall therefore directly retort this Observation, shewing that these Authors believ'd
the

the Soul to be a Principle naturally Immortal ; and that accordingly all their Thoughts and Expressions were a good ground-work for establishing the same Sentiment in the Church. *Secondly*, I shall run over the whole List of these Authorities which Mr. *Dodwel* brings for the Soul's natural Mortality : viz. S. *Justin Martyr*, *Tatian*, S. *Irenæus*, *Athenagoras*, *Theophilus Antiochenus*, *Tertullian*, S. *Cyprian*, *Arnobius*, *Lactantius* and S. *Athanasius*. This done, I shall observe, that if of these Authors one was a notorious Heretic, as *Tatian* ; and another, when he wrote his Treatise, was an Heathen, as *Arnobius* ; and that if, of the whole List, this very *Tatian* the Heretic, and *Arnobius* the Heathen, do in some measure seem to conspire with Mr. *Dodwel*, but most of the other Orthodox and Holy Fathers absolutely declare against him, then he has indeed deprav'd Antiquity to some purpose, and serv'd only to discover the greater Contagion of Heresy with which he is infected, *Thirdly*, I shall add an Observation concerning some other Authors, who either were co-temporary to, or immediate Successors of those cited by Mr. *Dodwel* : and then taking Advantage of his confessing their opposition to him, I shall shew how

far their Authority in this point is to be esteem'd, as well as that of the Fathers who preceded them.

I. 2. The *First* part of this Chapter therefore is to be employ'd in a Vindication of the *Hellenist* and *Platonic Jews*, together with the *Greek* Interpreters of the *Old Testament* : and this the rather, because this is the proper place of refuting Mr. *Dodwel's* groundless Distinction betwixt *Pnoë* and *Pneuma*, and the ill use he makes of a Distinction allowed by the Antients betwixt the *Soul* and *Spirit*. For whereas in the first place he alleges that Text of *Gen. 2. 7.*

Ἐπλασεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ ἄνθρωπον χεὶν λαβὼν ἀπὸ τῆ γῆς καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ σπείρωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς : i. e. *God formed Man of the dust of the Ground, and breathed into his Nostrils the Breath of Life* : pretending that this *Pnoë* or *Breath*, is a Principle so distinct from the *Pneuma* or *Spirit*, that the former only was given to the first Man at his Creation, or his Posterity at their Birth, but the latter only at their entrance into a Covenant of Grace ; I shall shew on the contrary, that *Pnoë* and *Pneuma* are words promiscuously us'd by these Authors, to signify one and the same thing. And whereas in the second place, Mr. *Dodwel* pretends that these Authors made such a distinction betwixt the *Soul* and
Spirit,

Spirit, i. e. the $\psi\chi\eta$ and the $\pi\rho\acute{o}\mu\alpha$, that they conceiv'd the $\pi\rho\acute{o}\mu\alpha$ not as any original Ingredient of our Human Constitution, but as something afterwards adventitious to it : I shall shew on the other side, that these and other antient Authors, who did indeed allow a distinction between $\psi\chi\eta$ and $\pi\rho\acute{o}\mu\alpha$, yet understood the $\pi\rho\acute{o}\mu\alpha$ not to be afterwards adventitious to our Constitution, but to be, together with the $\psi\chi\eta$, an original Ingredient of our Nature. And whereas lastly, Mr. Dodwel would have urg'd these Notions of these Authors in favour of what he advances concerning the Soul's natural Mortality ; I shall shew the Absurdity of pretending this from any Thought or Expression, dropt by the Authors of that Class ; in that they were eminently of Opinion, that the Soul is a Principle naturally Immortal.

3. Now to take away in the first place all possible pretence of the *Hellenists* having conceiv'd any real distinction betwixt $\pi\rho\acute{o}\nu$ and $\pi\rho\acute{o}\mu\alpha$, I affirm on the other side, that these were words so far Synonymous in the Sense of those Authors, that they have us'd them promiscuously, to signify one and the same thing. Thus to give an Instance, where 'tis impossible to allege any difference of meaning, we read 3 *Kin.*

17. 17. ἐκ ὑπελείφθη ἐν αὐτῷ πνεῦμα, but *Dan.*
 10. 17. πνοὴ ἐκ ὑπελείφθη ἐν ἐμοί. The like is
 to be observ'd *Gen.* 7. 22. where we read
 πάντα ὅσα ἔχει πνοὴν ζωῆς ; and *Gen.* 7. 15.
 where the same, and no other Thought, is
 expressed by πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐν ᾗ ὄρεται πνεῦμα ζωῆς. To
 these Authors who first employ'd these
 words in the Canonical Text, is to be
 added the Apocryphal Author of the Book
 of *Wisdom*, cap. 15. v. 11. where having
 regard to the Text of *Genesis*, in which
 God ἐνεφύσησεν πνοὴν ζωῆς, he therefore gives
 God the Title of ἐμφυσήσαντα πνεῦμα ζωπκόν :
 plainly making πνεῦμα ζωπκόν the same with
 πνοὴ ζωῆς. *Philo Judæus*, in a fit of Allego-
 ry, the only blemish that is too frequent
 in that incomparable Author, pretends in-
 deed, in one place, to distinguish the πνοὴ
 from the πνεῦμα : but 'tis only to make
 πνεῦμα signifie a more violent, and πνοὴ a
 more gentle Blast : i. e. to find a difference
 in the Circumstance, not in the Nature of
 the Thing. Yet this poor Shadow of an
 Authority is urg'd by Mr. *Dodwel* with a
 mighty boast. But he must not think that
 this proves *Philo Judæus*, any more than
 it does St. *Austin*, to be of his Opinion.
 Notwithstanding his Allegorical Distinction,
Philo is our clearest Witness for a real Agree-
 ment betwixt the πνοὴ and the πνεῦμα : For
 while

while he is commenting on the $\chi\epsilon\iota$ and the $\pi\nu\omicron\iota$ ζῶης, words by which the two constituent parts of Man are express'd in the above-mention'd Text, he tells us how clearly from hence we must conclude that Man is compounded * $\epsilon\kappa$

$\gamma\alpha\rho\ \delta\epsilon\varsigma\ \iota\sigma\iota\alpha\varsigma\ \kappa\upsilon\ \pi\nu\delta\iota\mu\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\ \delta\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$. In ** Philo de Mundi opif. pag. 30.*

another place, where he gives likewise a Comment on the same words, 'tis his express Doctrine that * $\epsilon\mu\pi\upsilon\epsilon\omicron\nu\ \delta\epsilon\iota\nu\ \delta\ \Theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, ** Leg. alleg. pag. 47.*

$\tau\omicron\ \delta\ \delta\epsilon\chi\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\ \delta\ \nu\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$, $\tau\omicron\ \delta\ \delta\alpha\pi\nu\epsilon\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omicron\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$: i. e.

The Breather was God ; that which receiv'd the Breath was the Mind of Man, and the Breath which he receiv'd was the Pneuma.

But if this is not sufficient Evidence that Philo, in the History of the Creation, allow'd no real difference betwixt the $\pi\nu\omicron\iota$ and the $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ ζῶης, we may luckily observe, that, quoting this Text in another part of his Works, (*vid. pag. 170.*) he puts $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ instead of $\pi\nu\omicron\iota$, and reads the words in question $\epsilon\nu\epsilon\phi\acute{\iota}\sigma\theta\eta\epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\ \sigma\epsilon\gamma\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon$ (not $\pi\nu\omicron\iota$ but) $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ ζῶης. So far were these Authors from imagining that 'twas a $\pi\nu\omicron\iota$ only, and not a $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$, with which God endued Man at his first Creation. But this will further appear by what I shall observe in the second place, of the manner in which they conceiv'd a distinction betwixt the $\chi\epsilon\iota$ and

and the *πνεῦμα* ; i. e. *the Soul and Spirit*.

4. For 'tis indeed notorious that these Authors make a difference betwixt Soul and Spirit, the *Platonists* resolving the whole composition of Human Nature into *νῦς*, *ψυχή*, and *σῶμα* ; and *πνεῦμα* having succeeded, according to the *Hellenist* and Christian Writers, into the place of *νῦς*. But then as the Heathen *Platonists* conceiv'd the *νῦς* to be an ingredient of Human Nature, and not adventitious to it ; no otherwise did the Jewish *Platonists* conceive of *πνεῦμα*. To this purpose I shall here allege several antient Passages, which as they intimate a clear distinction between Soul and Spirit, so likewise do they imply that the Spirit and Soul together are equally to be esteem'd Ingredients in the Frame of Man. I begin with those words of *Josephus* ; Πνεῦμα ἐνέτικεν αὐτῷ καὶ ψυχὴν : i. e. *God infus'd a Spirit and a Soul into the Earthy Mass.* (*Ant. lib. I. c. I.*) But as this is the Sentiment of *Josephus* concerning the Original of the First Man ; so the Author of the Book of *Wisdom* is still more express concerning the Birth of that Man's Posterity ; Ἡ γνῶσις ἢ πλάσαντα αὐτὸν, καὶ ἢ ἐμπνέσαντα αὐτῷ ψυχὴν ἐνεργῶσαν καὶ ἐμφυσήσαντα πνεῦμα ζωτικόν. i. e. *He knew not his Maker, and him that inspired into him an active Soul, and breath-*
ed

ed in a Living Spirit. (Wisd. 15. 11.) If these Passages do indeed plainly distinguish the Spirit from the Soul of Man, they do at the same time profess as plainly, that the Spirit, as well as the Soul, is one original Principle in the constitution of our Nature. Add to this, that *Philo* not only asserts it to be such a Principle, but explains, in a very clear Hypothesis, in what manner it is so. *For every one of us* (says he, pag. 170.) *must be conceiv'd to be a ζῷον and an ἄνθρωπος ; i. e. an Animal and a Man. To each of these there is allotted a connatural respective Power : i. e. to the Animal a Power of Life, and to the Man a Power of Reason.* The first of these he derives from a Soul having its Essence in the *Bloud*, but the second from a Soul which has its Essence in the *Spirit*. By what clearer Hypothesis could he justify an Expression he before had us'd, (pag. 14.) in which he makes the *νῦς*, i. e. the *νοῦμα*, to be the Soul as it were of the Soul it self ? Τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ (says he) *νῦν ὑζάρητον ἐδωρέτο, ψυχὴν καὶ ψυχὴν.* No wonder then, if after these Masters 'twas a receiv'd Notion with the Fathers of the Church, that Man consisted of three different Principles, a Body, a Soul, and Spirit : That the Spirit had the same relation to the Soul, which the Soul had to the Body ;
and

and that therefore if the Soul can leave the Body, the Spirit in like manner could leave the Soul. For something like these Expressions is indeed to be observ'd in *Justin Martyr* ; yet from what I have above remark'd, I shall by and by clear him of having dropt any thing in favour of the Soul's natural Mortality. At present only I am to clear the *Hellenists* from the like Imputation, on account of any thing they may have advanc'd concerning the distinction betwixt Soul and Spirit. For upon the whole, their reasoning amounts to no more than this ; viz. that whereas the *Aristotelians* have suppos'd the Powers of Sensation and Intellection to be two different Faculties of the same Principle ; the *Platonists* on the contrary, and with them the *Hellenist* Jews and Christians, suppose these to be two distinct Principles, constituting together with the Body the whole Frame of Man. And to the first of these Principles, they appropriate the name of Soul ; but to the second, the name of Spirit. Whereas therefore Mr. *Dodwel* founds the whole Immortality of Man upon the Spirit ; and would insinuate from this distinction of Soul and Spirit, that the Soul only, and not the Spirit, was given to Man in his Creation ; I have prov'd on the contrary,

trary, that they who make this distinction betwixt Soul and Spirit, do suppose the Spirit, as well as the Soul, to be an Ingredient of Man in his Creation ; and consequently that they give no handle for supposing the better part of our Constitution to be a Principle naturally Mortal.

5. I come now in the third place to observe, that 'twas unreasonable to expect any such Assistance from the Authors of this Class ; and that without a strange excess of Absurdity, Mr. *Dodwel* could never strain any Expressions of theirs to favour the Mortality of the Soul, since they were eminently of Opinion that what, in the *Aristotelian* Schemes, we call the Soul, is a Principle naturally Immortal. This may first be illustrated from those words of the Book of *Wisdom* (1. 13.) Θεὸς δὲ θάνατον ἐκ ἐπίτ-
νου, i. e. *God made not Death ; but as for*
Man more particularly, him he ἐκποίησεν εἰς ἀφ-
θαρσίαν (2. 23.) i. e. *him he created to Immor-*
tality. But not insisting at present upon any other, I shall put the Issue of this Point on the Authority of *Philo* ; that so at the same time I may vindicate that Divine Writer from a flagrant Injury of Mr. *Dodwel*. For according to that

* ψαδολόγον and ἀπατηλόν which

* See *Introd.* §. 20.

have been always observ'd to be the inseparable

parable Concomitants of Heresy ; He tells us (6. 7.) that *Philo* makes *Man* to consist of Body and Soul, yet *both Mortal*. But to convict him of a wilful Heretical Design of forcing Great and Venerable Authors to lye, in Favour of his Hypothesis, while he conceals the full Consent that some Scandalous ones have given to it ; I shall here at large transcribe that very Passage which lay under his Eye, when he advanc'd so great a Falshood. And this I shall do the rather, because it is a Passage that decides the whole Controversy I have maintain'd against him, concerning the Sentiments of the *Hellenist Jews*. For in the first place, it intimates that the *πνεῦμα* (*Gen. 2. 7.*) is really not to be distinguish'd from the *πνεῦμα θεῶν*. In the next place it affirms, that this *πνεῦμα θεῶν* was given even to that which he calls the *sensible Man* in his Creation. And in the last place, it asserts that this *πνεῦμα θεῶν*, so inspir'd at the Creation, has made Man, who was Mortal in his material and visible part, to be nevertheless Immortal in that part which is intellectual and invisible. He tells us therefore (and that as the Sense of *Moses* himself,) in his Book *de Mundi Opificio*, (pag. 30.)

Ἄριστον δὲ καὶ ὅτι μίαν ἀνθρώπου τὴν καὶ πνεύματι συνδυαμένην εἶναι οὐ γὰρ δύο εἶναι καὶ πνεύματι θεῶν. Γενεσίων 2. 7. τὸ πνεῦμα

σῶμα χῆν τῷ τεχνίτῃ λαβόντῃ καὶ μορφὴν ἀνθρώπινην ἔχον
αὐτὸ διαπλάσαντῃ. Τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν ἀπ' ἑδνῶς γυντῆ τοῦ
ἐξέπαρ, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἡγαγόντῃ ὅτ' αἰώντων. Τὸ
δὲ ἐνεφύσησεν, ἔδεν ἦν ἕτερον ἢ πνεῦμα θεῖον ὑπὸ τῇ μαχαίρᾳ
καὶ ἀδελφίμῳ ἐκείνης φύσεως ὑποκίαν τὴν ἐνδοθεὶ σπλά-
γμον, ἐπ' ἀφελείᾳ τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν. ἵν' εἰ καὶ θνητὸν ὅτι καὶ τὴν
ἐσθλῶν μερίδα, καὶ γὰρ τὴν ἀδελφὸν ἀθανάτησιν. Διὸ
καὶ κλειῶς ἀν' ἑαυτῇ τῇ ἀνθρώπινῃ θνητῇ καὶ ἀθάνατῃ φύσεως
εἶναι μεδέειον, ἐκατέρᾳ, ὅσον ἀναγκαῖον ὅτι, κατέχοντα, καὶ
μνηστῆς θνητὸν ὁμῶς καὶ ἀθάνατον. Θνητὸν μὲν καὶ τὸ σῶμα
καὶ τῶν δαίμων, ἀθάνατον : i. e. *The Frame of
the sensible and particular Man is compound-
ed of an Earthy Substance and a Divine
Spirit. For the Body was made, while the
Creator took Clay, and form'd it into Human
Shape ; but the Soul was taken from no crea-
ted Being, but from the Father and Gover-
nour of the Universe. For that which he
Breath'd was nothing else but a Divine Spi-
rit, transplanted hither from that blessed
and happy Nature, for the Advantage of
our Race : that tho' it be Mortal as to its
visible part, yet at least as to that part which
is invisible, it might be Immortal. So that
one may properly say of Man, that he is a
middle betwixt a Mortal and an Immortal
Nature, partaking as far as is necessary of
both ; and that he is Mortal and Immortal
at the same time. Mortal indeed as to his
Body, but as to his Mind, Immortal. Let
the*

the World observe this Instance of the Integrity of Mr. *Dodwel*; and judge at the same time, whether a less Shame than this could well have overtaken that Person, who from *Platonists*, i. e. from a Sect of Men who profess to espouse the Immortality of the Soul, would prove that the Soul is Mortal. How much more Rational is the Observation of *Eusebius*? who, instead of imagining that any Expressions of *Plato* had betray'd the *Jews* into a Persuasion that the Soul was Mortal, concludes rather that *They* prescrib'd to him in those admirable Reasons by which he maintains its Immortality. This may be seen at large in a Chapter which he introduces with words remarkably to our present purpose.

Ἐν τοῖς περὶ ψυχῆς ἀθανασίας ἔδιν Μωσέως ὁ Πλάτων δίδωται τῇ δόξει. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτος ἀθάνατον εἶναι εἶναι τὴν ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ ψυχὴν αἰείσας. i. e. *As to the Immortality of the Soul, Plato has differ'd nothing from the Opinion of Moses. For 'twas Moses who first defin'd the Soul of Man to be an Immortal Substance.* Euseb. *præp. Evang. lib. 11. cap. 25.* And what farther Justice he has done, on this Subject, to *Philo*, to *Moses*, and even to that particular Text of *Gen. (2. 7.)* so much abus'd by *Socinus* and Mr. *Dodwel*, may be seen *lib. 7. cap. 17.* of the same Work.

6. Thus

6. Thus much for the *Hellenist* and *Platonic Jews*. I shall now proceed to the above-recited Catalogue of the Fathers, after having added one word in Justice to the Heathen *Theology*. For even this too our Author has traduc'd, as favourable to his unwarrantable *Hypothesis*. But in return to this, I shall observe that there were indeed some Schemes in antient Philosophy, as there are now too many in Religion, that deserv'd the name of Heresies. The most pestilent of these was *Stoicism*; a Heresy which, for its peculiar Clearness and Subtilty, made much the same figure in Heathenism, as *Socinianism* has since done in Christianity. As therefore in the foregoing Chapter, I have set forth Mr. *Dodwel's* ample conformity to the *Socinian* Schemes; so (to demonstrate that affinity by which Heresies of all sorts are related to one another) I shall detect likewise his happy concurrence with the *Stoics*, in the conclusion of this Discourse. Let it suffice only in this place, to have affirm'd, that besides the *Stoics* and the *Epicureans*, the other truly venerable Sects of Heathen Philosophy, were far more Orthodox than he is, as to the everlasting duration of the Soul. Infomuch that if any tender Conscience is now stagger'd at what a Christian

H

Author

Author has said in favour of its Mortality; such an one cannot be better rectified on that Subject, than by reading *Socrates* in the *Phædo* of *Plato*, concerning the *Immortality of the Soul*; and the first *Tusculan* of *Cicero*, concerning the *Contempt of Death*. 'Tis in the last of these that *Cicero* defies all that ever can be objected against what *Plato* and himself advance for the Eternity of the Soul. And this says he, *Licet concurrent Plebeii omnes Philosophi; sic enim ii qui a Platone & Socrate & ab eâ familiâ dissident, appellandi videntur*. They infer indeed too much when they conclude, *neq; nata est, & æterna est*. Yet the Disciple of *Pythagoras* is strictly Orthodox, who believes an endless Condition after a deliverance from the Body, and expects in the words of *Empedocles*, to be;

— θεός, ἀμβροσίος, ἐκ τῆς θνήσκουσας. i. e.

As God, eternal; and exempt from Death.

But whereas Mr. *Dodwel* is fullest of these Delusions in the 8th and 25th Paragraphs of his Discourse; and whereas he would there inform us, that the Heathen Practice of Deifying their *Heroes* implied, that they believ'd great and good Souls to be indued with an Immortalizing Principle,
but

but that vulgar ones fell with the Body to the Earth : To this I Answer, that according to an unhappy Custom of his own, he intirely mistakes the Inference. For on the contrary, nothing else was then insinuated by all this, but that God having made all Souls Immortal, some by their extraordinary Vertues could make themselves Divine. To confirm the Truth of this, I appeal to *Cicero*, as to an Oracle happily preserv'd for the Reproof of this very Innovation. *Quod ex Hominum genere consecratos, sicut Herculem, & ceteros coli Lex jubet, indicat omnium quidem Animos Immortales esse, sed fortium bonorumq; Divinos.* Cic. lib. 2. de Legibus.

7. But what was thought by that inimitable Philosopher to be the Voice of the Law, and the Sense of whole Religious Commonwealths, was of old likewise deliver'd by the Prince of Poets, and Father of that antient Theology. *Od. λ. ver. 220.*

Ἄλλ' αὐτῇ δῖκῃ ὄσι θεῶν, ὅτε καὶ τε δύνανται.
 Οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ σάρκασι καὶ ὅσα ἴνα ἔχουσιν,
 Ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν τὸ πρὸς κρατερὸν μῖνον αἰδομένοι
 Δάμνα, ἐπεὶ καὶ πρῶτα λίπη λεῦκ' ὅσα θυμὸς,
 Ψυχὴ δ' ἢ τ' ὄνειρος ἀποσταμένη πικρὸς ἔσται. i. ε.

*Such is the lot of Mortals, when they dye.
Nerves then no more their Bones and Mus-
cles bind :*

*But these beneath the Fire's devouring force
Are spent ; when once the Mind the Carcass
leaves,*

*And the wing'd Soul fleets, like a Dream,
away.*

This was his Doctrine concerning the Condition of *ordinary* departed Souls, all of which, as he taught, descended to the place whither he had then led *Ulysses* ; *i. e.* to *Ades*, or the Receptacle of the Dead. But having occasion to give him an interview with one of the *Heroic* Class, particularly with the Person instanc'd above by *Cicero*, he ascribes to him not only an Immortality, but a Divinity too, after this manner :

Τὸν ὃ μέγ', εἰσινόησα βίην Ἡρακλεΐην ·

Ἐίδωλον · αὐτὸς ὃ μέγ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι

τέρπειται ἐν δαίλει. ——— Ver. 600. i. c.

*I afterwards observ'd stout Hercules :
His Spectre 'twas : For He himself above
Is always feasting with Immortal Gods.*

II. 8. By this short Account of the best
Heathen Theologists, as well as of the *Hel-
lenist*

lenist Jews, I have now clear'd my way to those Authorities which are to be the main Subject of this Chapter : I mean the Testimony of the purest and most antient Fathers of the Church. To these I now appeal for the Decision of this Question, Whether the Soul of Man was by God created an Immortal Substance, and of such a Nature, as needs not any new Indulgence of its Creator that it might continue to live for ever. In this Appeal I shall follow the same order that our Adversary has observ'd ; beginning with the same Person, and with the same dependance on his Suffrage to the affirmative, as he is alleg'd by Mr. *Dodwel* for the negative of our Question. This therefore is

S. Justin Martyr.

Now this Learned and Ingenious Father has long suffer'd in this Point, by vulgar Error, as well as by the late Attempt of Mr. *Dodwel*. One would therefore have imagin'd, that Mr. *Dodwel* was the Man born to redress the Injuries of so great a Reputation, rather than to load it with more Calumny, and with a Charge of farther Innovations concerning the Nature of Human Souls. But since the latter is unexpectedly fall'n out, I shall therefore employ

ploy the greater pains in clearing the Opinions, and with them the Credit of this Father. And this I hope to do so effectually, as at length to make *Justin Martyr* an ample Evidence against the Positions of Mr. *Dodwel*, but Mr. *Dodwel* to be a notorious falsifier of those of *Justin Martyr*.

9. If any late Authors or Editors of our own Nation have represented *Justin Martyr* as a Teacher of the Soul's natural Mortality, they best know from whose *noë* and *auspiciis* they have imbib'd that Error, as he has been dictating his Opinions in promiscuous Company. And if the excellent Monsieur *Du Pin* has thought him favourable, in some places, (though not in others) to the annihilation of wicked Souls, that mistake may well be pardon'd to so great a Man in the cursory abstract he has given us of a whole Library of Authors. But omitting these, I shall now look higher into Antiquity, to detect the first Venter of this Aspersion ; that so, together with him, I may bring an Antient and Learned Advocate of *Justin Martyr* upon the Stage. The first therefore that ever fix'd so gross a Calumny on this Father, was a tedious, botching, trifling, inconsistent Heretic, by Name *Stephen Gobar* : called otherwise, (and deservedly enough,

Justin Martyr

no

no doubt,) *Stephen* the *Tri-theist*. This contemptible Scrap-gatherer has been unluckily preserv'd by *Photius*; (*cod. 232.*) and never to so good a purpose as in this present Controversy. For he tells us, that *Gobar* had heap'd together no less than Fifty-two Heads of different and indeed contrary Opinions; of which one side was suppos'd to be condemn'd, the other to be establish'd as Ecclesiastical. The Ecclesiastical Opinions He confirm'd (says *Photius*) by the Testimony of the most accurate among the Antients, but the condemn'd ones by Testimony of Antients not very accurate, and of which some did not indeed favour, but were thought only by *Gobar* to favour, the condemn'd Opinion. Now this very wise *Gobar*, upon this Occasion, and in this very Point which I am now controverting with Mr. *Dodwel*, first broach'd the like Reflexion upon *Justin Martyr*. But how injurious the Heretic was in this; and how just a Defence the Father has found from *Photius*, I shall presently observe. In the mean time while we are upon this Hue and Cry after Heresy, let us, upon meer Suspicion, look a little farther into *Gobar*; and see whether we can discover, in that *Rhapsody* of his, any other Positions of Mr. *Dodwel*. And

Justin Martyr.

H 4

here

here, alas, who would expect to find three of his laudable Points offering themselves freely at the first view ? Yet here they are, represented after Gobar's fashion, sometimes before, and sometimes after the contrary of each. — 1. "Οτι ἡ πνοὴ ἦν ἐνεφύσησιν

ὁ Θεὸς εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ Αδάμ πρὸς χαίρειν ἦν καὶ ἐκ ὧς τὸ πνεῦμα αἰώνιον. Καὶ ὅτι ἐπὶ πρὸς χαίρειν ἦν, ἀλλὰ ψυχὴ ἀθάνατος.

2. "Οτι ἐπὶ πρὸς χαίρειν ἦν, ἔτε ψυχὴ, ἀλλὰ νῦν ὡς ἐκ τῶν συνκεῖσθαι μερῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, νῦν τε καὶ ψυχὴ καὶ σῶμα.

3. "Οτι αἱ λογικαὶ ψυχαὶ, καὶ πάντα τὰ νεκρὰ κτίσματα φύσει καὶ κατὰ φύσιν εἰσιν ἀφθάρτα· καὶ ἐκ τούτων ἀντικείμενα. ὅτι ἐπὶ φύσει ἀλλὰ χάριτι εἰσιν ἀθάνατα. i. e.

1. *That the Pnoë (or Breath) which God breath'd into Adam's Nostrils was Temporary, and not in the nature of an Eternal Pneuma, (or Spirit.) And then on the other side, that it was not Temporary, but the Immortal Soul.* 2. *That it was neither Temporary nor the Soul it self, but the Mind. So that Man consisted of three parts, viz. Mind, Soul and Body.* 3. *That Rational Souls, and all Intellectual Creatures, by virtue of their Nature, are incorruptible. And on the contrary, that they are Immortal, not by Nature, but by Grace.* — Mr. Dodwel's diffusive Knowledge of Antiquity cannot, I believe, direct us to any other single Author that can furnish him with so many of his own Words and Thoughts, as Gobar

Justin Martyr.

has

has here done. But to make no unseasonable Reflexions on the mutual Credit which they lend to one another, I shall pass on to the Vindication of *Justin Martyr*, whom, by I know not what Heretical Combination, they have jointly endeavour'd to misrepresent.

10. *Justin*, in his Dialogue with *Trypho*, produces another Dialogue betwixt himself, under the Character of a Novice; and a Spectre or Genius, that appear'd to him under the Character of his Monitor, or his Adviser to look into Christianity. 'Tis from this small *Episode*, thus interwoven into this Father's Works, that Mr. *Dodwel* would persuade the World that he taught the Mortality of the Soul. But because *Justin Martyr* acted the part only of a Novice in this Dialogue, he is fain to obtrude upon us, as the Opinion of *Justin*, what is said by that Genius which discourses with him. The Passages that are cited to this purpose by Mr. *Dodwel*, I now come distinctly to examine. He begins therefore with a Limb of an imperfect Sentence; *ὁ δὲ μὴ αἰώνιον χρηὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ*: i. e. *We are not to call the Soul Immortal*. Words on which he puts a mighty stress, and seems to think 'em decisive of this whole Controversy. But to abate something of this

Justin Martyr.

Assurance;

Assurance ; what if we produce the same, or more peremptory Assertion, from an Author who abhor'd the Consequence which Mr. *Dodwel* would draw from hence? Such an one therefore is very happily extant in St. *Austin*, or (which in this case is all one) him who takes the Name of St. *Austin*, in a Sermon of his *de Sanctis*. *Certè Anima mortalis est*, says that Author, who believ'd nothing less than the natural Mortality of the Soul. But he launches out far beyond *Justin Martyr*, and adds, *Nam & potest mori : intelligat charitas vestra, & nulla quæstio remanebit ; audeo dicere, Anima potest mori*. What now can be the Reason that has induc'd a Man to talk in this strain, who professes at the same time to believe the Soul Immortal ? Nothing in truth but this, viz. because, says he, *Est quædam Immortalitas vera, Immortalitas que est omnimoda incommutabilitas, de quâ dicit Apostolus loquens de Deo, Qui solus habet Immortalitatem*. If now St. *Justin Martyr* shall give us the same Reason for his denying the Title of Immortal to the Soul, which this Author does ; it will be a fair Presumption, that he believ'd no more than that Author did, of the Soul's natural Mortality. To shew therefore, if he has said the same thing, that he said it for

Justin Martyr.

the

the same, and no other Reason ; I shall here give that intire Sentence, which Mr. Dodwel (too conscious of what the whole implies) has quoted but by halves. ἐν μὲν αἰδανάῳ χρηὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ. Ὅτι εἰ αἰδανάῳ ἔστι, καὶ ἀγήνη-
 10 δηλαδή. Ἀγήνηῳ δὲ καὶ αἰδανάῳ ἔστι καὶ τῖνας λεγο-
 μένους Πλατωνικῆς. i. e. We are not to call the Soul Immortal ; because if it is Immortal, 'tis clearly Increated too. For according to those we call Platonists, 'tis Increated and Immortal. He adds, Ἐὰ δ' ὁ κόσμος γινώσκει, ἀνάγκη καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς γινώσκειν. i. e. If the World, as you allow, is indeed Created, then is it necessary for Souls to have been Created too.

II. From hence it unanswerably appears that Justin Martyr was only wary of the word Immortal, on the same account that the above-mention'd Sermonizer was. He only lets us farther into the Reasons for such a wariness ; viz. because Immortal sounds too much like Increate. And in truth, the classical acceptation of those words gave him no little handle for such an apprehension. For by the same reason that αἰδανασία is oppos'd to γένεσις in * Ocellus Lucanus (cap. 2.) αἰδανάῳ will appear consignificant to ἀγήνηῳ. This indeed must needs have made αἰδανάῳ be thought an offensive word : and

Justin Martyr.

that

* Ἰσθμὸς γὰρ ἔστιν αἰδανασίας καὶ γένεσις ὁ περὶ τὴν σελήνην δόξμα.

that the rather, because the *Platonists* would prove the Soul to be indeed ἀρχή as well as ἀθάνατος ; i. e. to have had no Beginning, as they expected it should have no End. For this Reason I before observ'd, that *Plato* and *Cicero* conclude too much when they say, Ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἀρχόντων τὴν καὶ ἀθάνατον ψυχὴν ἂν εἴη, i. e. *Neq; nata est certe, & æterna est.* And *Tertullian* as well as *Justin Martyr*, was careful, on the same account, of distinguishing betwixt the Christian and Platonic Doctrine of the Soul's Immortality. Nos (says he, *lib. de Animâ, cap. 4.*) *ex flatu Dei animam professi, initium ei deputamus. Hoc Plato excludit, innatam & infectam animam volens.* Of Philosophers he before observ'd, that *alii Immortalem negant animam, alii plusquam Immortalem adfirmant.* (cap. 3.) He therefore in that Treatise, and *Justin Martyr* likewise in this, has caution'd us not to ascribe too much or too little to the nature of the Soul : Too much, by thinking that it has the Immortality of God ; or too little, by imagining that 'tis liable to the Mortality of the Body. For he before had told us, that the Privilege of Immortality was misconceiv'd by some Men, as equalling the Soul to God himself, and consequently as placing them above the fear of Punishment. These were

Justin Martyr.

they

they who ἡποσημαίνοντο ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀσώματον τὴν ψυχὴν
 ὥς τε καὶ ἡ δόξασις ἡγένηται δώσειν δίκην. An In-
 ference indeed that was absurd enough :
 but which we see, was too common in those
 times, and was pleaded in good earnest by
Arnobius. *Quid poterit territari formidinis*
alicujus horrore, cui fuerit persuasum tam se
esse Immortalem quam ipsum Deum ? (*Adv.*
Gent. lib. 2.) While Immortality was un-
 derstood in so perverse a sense, and so per-
 verse Consequences were drawn from it,
 no wonder if a Skilful and Pious Father,
 has warn'd us of applying the word Im-
 mortal, too largely, to the Soul.

12. These are so many just Reflexions
 which may safely direct us to the meaning
 of *Justin Martyr*, when he allows those
 words of the Genius he is discoursing with,
 ὁ μὲν ἀθάνατον χρὴ λέγειν τὴν ψυχὴν. And by the
 help of these it will be easy to answer the
 following Passages, brought piece-meal
 likewise by Mr. *Dodwel* to the same pur-
 pose. But having no need of any Dis-
 guise, I shall here transcribe them in the
 same order and extent as they are found in
 the good Father's Works. ἐκ αὐτῶν ἀθάνατοι αἱ
 ψυχαὶ (says the Genius.) ἐκ, (says the Mar-
 tyr, though now in the Person of a No-
 vice) ἐπειδὴ καὶ ὁ κόσμος γεννητὸς ἡμῶν ἐφάρτη. Ἀλλὰ μὲν
 ἐστὶν ἀποθνήσκον φησὶ πάντες τὰς ψυχὰς ἐγὼ. ἐρωτῶν γὰρ ἦν

Justin Martyr.

ὥς

ὡς ἀληθῶς τοῖς κακοῖς Ἀλλὰ τί ; τὰς μὲν ἧς εὐσεβῶν
κρίσινί ποί χάρω μένειν, τὰς δ' ἀδίκας καὶ πονηράς ἐν
χείρσιν ἢ τ' κρίσεως ἐκδεχόμενας χρόνον τότε ἕως αἱ μὲν
ἀξίαι τοῦ Θεοῦ φανεῖσθαι, ἢ ἐκ ἀποθνήσκουσιν ἔπ., αἱ δ' κολαζόν-
ται, ἐς αὖν αὐτὰς καὶ εἶναι καὶ κολαζέσθαι ὁ Θεὸς θέλει. i. e.
Souls therefore (says the *Genius*) are not Im-
mortal. No ; (says the *Martyr*) For the
whole World must be own'd to have been
Create. Yet I affirm not (says the *Genius*)
that Souls do all die. For this were indeed
an Advantage to the Wicked. What there-
fore ? Why the Souls of the Righteous remain
in some happy place, but those of the Wicked
in some unhappy one, expecting the time of
Judgment. So then, some which shall in-
deed appear worthy of God die no more,
but others are punish'd, if God shall be
willing that they shall Be, and be punish'd.
From these words Mr. Dodwel would infer
two particulars : The First of which is
this ; viz. that by this Caution, I affirm
not that Souls do all die, 'tis plainly im-
plied that some Souls did actually die. To
this I Answer, that though I have indeed
so Translated the words, yet here, where
I can give a Reason for what I do, I
shall presume to Translate them far other-
wise : i. e. I affirm not that Souls do alto-
gether die, making ἐκ ἀποθνήσκουσιν πῶτας, to be

Justin Martyr.

the

the same as *non omnis moriar*, in a * Poet that made a very good use of his exact Knowledge of the Greek Language. *πίσις* may well be thought to have crept into this Sentence, in imitation of *πίσις* in the *Phædo* of Plato, where we are taught that *θάνατος* is not *πίσις ἀπὸ πάσης* : i. e. that Death is not an entire dissolution, or an extinction of the *ὁλοκληρὸν*, i. e. all that, which it affects. And in favour of this Guess, since the same words do indeed there follow in * Plato as here in Justin Martyr, (viz.

* Hor. lib. 3. ed. 3c.

* Vid. Plat. Phad. Edit. Cantab. p. 167.

ἰσχυρὸν αὖ ἢ τοῖς κακοῖς) 'twill make it more than probable that this Sentence was only a Transcript of the other. Upon this ground it will be easy to affirm, that as the Man does not *omnis mori*, upon his Body being quitted by the Soul, so neither does the Soul *πᾶσα ἀποθνήσκειν*, upon its sensitive branch being quitted by the spiritual. This is strictly agreeable to their Schemes, who tell us of the three *μέμια*, or parts of the Soul, viz. the *λογικὸν*, the *θυμικὸν*, and the *σώθυμικον*, and then calling the two latter *φθαρτὰ*, or Mortal, say others have declar'd it their Opinion that *ψυχὴ πᾶσα ἀθάνατος*, i. e. all the Soul, or the whole Soul of Man is Immortal. Yet whose is this Account, but this

Justin Martyr.

this

this very Author's, whose Opinion we now are controverting, in his address to the Heathens of his time? (ſ. 7. *Edit. Oxon.*)

He likewise says the same thing, only in

* See Marcus Ere-
mita περί μετανοίας &
Nemesius de Nat. Ho-
minis. Cap. 1.

other terms, when con-
ceiving Man as a * τριμερὴς

ἄνθρωπος : i. e. as consisting
of σῶμα, ψυχὴ and πνεῦμα, he

supposes the πνεῦμα to be separable from
the ψυχὴ, as the ψυχὴ, in other Schemes, is

conceiv'd ordinarily separable from the
Body. According to this Hypothesis, no

wonder, if in the Greek Translator of Job

(7. 15.) we read ἀπαλλάξεις ἀπὸ πνεύματος μου τὴν

ψυχὴν μου, in St. Paul (Heb. 4. 12.) ἔχει μεισ-

μὺς ψυχῆς τὴν καὶ πνεύματος, and in our present

Author, ἀπέσπιν ἀπὸ ψυχῆς τὸ ζῶπικόν πνεῦμα. But

'twill be worth our while to transcribe the

whole Passage in which that Phrase occurs.

Ὡς περ ἄνθρωπος ἔστι διαπαντός ὄντων, ἐδὲ συνέστι αἰεὶ τῇ ψυχῇ

τὸ σῶμα, ἀλλ' ὅτε ἂν δέη λυθῆναι ἀρμονίαν ταύτην, κα-

ταλείπει ἡ ψυχὴ τὸ σῶμα, καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκ ὄντων ἔσται, καὶ

ὅταν δέη τὴν ψυχὴν μηκέτι εἶναι, ἀπέσπιν ἀπὸ αὐτῆς τὸ

ζῶπικόν πνεῦμα, καὶ ἐκ ἔστιν ἡ ψυχὴ ἐπὶ, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὴ

ὑδὴν ἐλήφθη, ἐκεῖσε χωρεῖ πάλιν : i. e. As the Man

is not perpetual, nor the Soul always present

to the Body ; but when 'tis necessary for that

Harmony to be dissolv'd, the Soul leaves the

Body, and the Man is no more a Man : so

likewise when 'tis convenient for the Soul to

Justin Martyr.

be

be no more, the enlivening Spirit removes it self from it, and then the Soul is no more a Soul, but departs thither from whence it was at first taken. Now though 'tis no where asserted by S. Justin, that the Soul, without God's extraordinary interposition, does or can actually ἀποθνήσκειν, yet the foregoing is a clear Hypothesis, how it may indeed ἀποθνήσκειν, and yet not ἀποθνήσκειν πᾶσι. For upon these Principles, we may say of the Soul as we ordinarily say of Man, that it survives (after the utmost separation it can suffer) in its better part, i. e. in the ψυχὴ ψυχῆς, in the λογικὸν μέρος, or the πνεῦμα ζωπύον. So that, far from overthrowing the certainty of an immortalizing Principle; this Hypothesis does indeed direct us to the truest and noblest we can suppose: It being an Axiom with all who write after these Schemes, and particularly with our present Author, that * πνεῦμα ἔ

πίσκει, i. e. the Spirit never dies. Mr. Dodwel is indeed so vain as to imagin that this πνεῦμα ζωπύον of S. Justin, is his Immortalizing Baptismal Spirit, or at least the πνεῦμα ζωπύον of St. Paul.

* Ἀνδραγαθίᾳ ὅτι ἔστι πνεῦμα ὃ ἐπὶ τῇ σαρκί, πνεῦμα ὃ ἐπὶ τῇ ψυχῇ. Just. Mart. de Resurrectione in Grab. Spicil. Sec. 2. P. 191. which compare with Tertullian adv. Marcion, lib. 5. cap. 9. Hoc resurgit quod cadit. With Methodius in Epiphan. P. 558. And with Irenæus, l. 5. c. 7.

But he may please to consider, that not

Justin Martyr.

I

only

only in the sense of the whole *Hellenist* and *Platonic* Class, but in the very tenour of the Expressions now cited from St. *Justin*, the πνεῦμα is a natural Principle of our Constitution, an Ingredient of Man in his Creation, having the same relation to the ψυχή, as the ψυχή has to σῶμα. As for ζωνών, 'tis not originally the Epithet of S. *Justin*, but of the Author of the Book of *Wisdom* and of *Philo*; Writers not much acquainted with the Vertue of Christian Baptism, or the Language of our Testament; but

* See §. 3. who thought they might very allowably * convert the πνεὺ ζωνῶν of *Genesis* into πνεῦμα ζωνών, and so meant, by that Phrase, a Principle of Nature and not of Grace, i. e. a Principle exactly contra-distinct to the πνεῦμα ζωοποιόν of St. *Paul*. Thus much in Reply to the first Inference of Mr. *Dodwel* from the words above-cited, at the beginning of this Paragraph. And in this I have been the larger, that at the same time I might account for the true Sense, in which S. *Justin* conceiv'd a distinction betwixt Soul and Spirit, and in which he always maintain'd the Immortality of our better part, whatever he may have said of that which, in his *Hypothesis*, he calls the Soul.

13. The *second* Inference which Mr. *Dodwel* makes from those words is this, *viz.* that they are a plain account of God's disposal of Human Souls, exactly the same with his, or that which we think so hardly of. To this I Answer, That the disposal of Human Souls here accounted for, is altogether different from his ; For by this account they all are reserv'd to the Day of Judgment, and then are afterwards awarded to a State either of Happiness or Punishment. But *He*, intolerable Innovator, awards the greatest part of Mankind to something which is neither Happiness nor Punishment ; *i. e.* Annihilation ; denying their concern in the Resurrection, much more in the Judgment that is to follow it. 'Tis true indeed that S. *Justin* says, they shall be continued under Punishment, if God pleases they should be conserv'd in Being. But this implies, that if they are not conserv'd, it must be his exerting some extraordinary Act of Power ; not, that they are conserv'd by such. Their Conservation is by his ordinary concurrence with that Incorrumpibility of Soul which he first gave in their Creation ; but their Annihilation would be by his stepping out of his usual course, and depriving the Soul of a Privilege with which he had first endued it.

Justin Martyr.

I 2

14. This

14. This at the same time may answer the false Inference which he makes from another Passage : ζῶνς ὃ ψυχὴ μετέχει, ἵνα ζῇ αὐτὴν ὁ Θεὸς βύβηται· ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἐμεδέξει ποτὶ, ὅταν αὐτὴν μὴ θέλοι ζῆν· i. e. *The Soul partakes of Life, because God is willing it should live; so then it shall sometime not partake thereof, if God at any time is not pleased that it should live.* The meaning of which is this; that though 'tis ordinary with God to concur with that Law of Nature, by which he has made Souls Incorruptible and Everlasting, yet is it in his Power to recede from thence, if ever it shall be his Pleasure so to do. For that the Soul lives is undeniable, says S. *Justin*: he only affirms that εἰ ζῇ, ἐξ ὧν ἔσται ζῇ ἀλλὰ μεταλαμβάνουσα τὴν ζωὴν, i. e. *If it lives, it lives not as being Life it self, but as having receiv'd that Life from God.* If now, (as upon these Principles it appears) the Soul can undergo no actual Death, but by the extraordinary Power and Pleasure of God, nor continue its natural Life, but by the ordinary Power and Pleasure of the same: who ascribes to the Soul any other than this Life? and who pretends that the Soul is not liable to that Death?

15. That which immediately follows after the last cited words of S. *Justin*, is
Justin Martyr. wisely

wisely conceal'd by Mr. Dodwel ; viz.
 ἡ δὲ αὐτῆς οὐκ ἐστὶν ὡς τῆς Θεοῦ , i. e. *The Life
 of the Soul is not self-existent like the Life
 of God.* For here indeed was a general
 Key to the whole scope and design of S.
Justin in this *Episode*, and such as inter-
 preted him to deny nothing to the Soul,
 but a necessary independent Immortality.
 And how could a Christian Father have
 done less than this Justice to the Divine
 Nature, since even *Plato*, the chief of
 those whom *Tertullian* observes to have
 made the Soul *plusquam Immortalem*, checks
 himself in that known Passage of his *Ti-
 mæus* ; and introduces the Creator thus as-
 serting his own true incommunicable Im-
 mortality ? 'Tis to all the *lesser Gods*, i. e.
 to something more, according to that *Theo-
 logy*, than bare Human Souls, that the
 Δημιουργὸς addresses himself in these words,
 Ἐπίπαρ γενένησθε, ἀθάνατοι μὲν ἔκ ἐστέ, ἐδ' ἄλλοι τὸ
 πάντα. ἔπ μὲν δὴ λυθήσεσθε γέ, ἐδὲ τεύξεσθε θανάτω
 μίσησ, ἢ ἐμῆς βολήσεως, μείζονθ' ἔπ δισμῷ καὶ κυριωτέρῃ,
 λαχόντες. &c. i. e. *Since ye had a Beginning,*
ye are not indeed Immortal, nor altogether
Indissoluble. Yet shall ye not be dissolv'd,
says he, nor be liable to the Fate of Death,
since ye have my Pleasure for a stronger and
more powerful Bond, than that by which you
were knit at your Creation. This Passage

Justin Martyr.

I 3

the

the *Martyr* recollected in that very *Episode* of which we are now disputing, and finding himself caution'd by the *Genius* not to attribute too much to the manner of the Soul's Existence, he replies therefore in the Person of the *Novice* ; and demands whether having thus rejected that Principle of *Plato* in his *Phædrus*, viz. that *ἡ ἀνάγκη ἀγέννητον τε καὶ ἀθάνατον ψυχὴν ἂν ᾔη*, i. e. *the Soul of necessity is Increate and Immortal* : He allowed it that other Immortality which *Plato* allows to the lesser Gods (*i. e.* indeed to the parts of the Universe) in his *Timæus*. But 'twill be expedient to hear the words of the Dialogue at large : Ἄρα τοιοῦτόν ἔστιν ὁ λέγων, οἷον καὶ Πλάτων ἐν Τιμαίῳ αἰνίσσεται περὶ τοῦ κόσμου λέγων, ὅτι αὐτὸς μὲν φθαρτός ἔστιν ἢ γινόμεν, ἐκλυθίσταται δὲ ἐκ τούτου δανάτω μοίρας διὰ τὴν βέλησιν τοῦ Θεοῦ ; τὸ δ' αὖτε σοι δοκεῖ καὶ περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ ἀπλῶς πάντων πᾶσι λέγοντος. Ὅσα γὰρ ἔστι μετὰ τῷ Θεῷ ἢ ἔστι πολλὰ, ταῦτα φύσιν φθαρτὴν ἔχειν, καὶ οἷα τὸ ἑξαφανισθῆναι καὶ μὴ εἶναι ἔπεται. Μόνον γὰρ ἀγέννητον καὶ ἀφθαρτόν ὁ Θεὸς ἔστι. Ταῦτα λοιπὰ πάντα μετὰ τούτων γινόμενα καὶ φθαρτά. Τέτα χρεὶν ἀποθνήσκουσιν αἱ ψυχαὶ καὶ κολάζονται, ἐπεὶ εἰ ἀγέννητοι ἦσαν, ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἔξιμαρτον. Ἀλλ' ἐπὶ ἐκῆσαι ποτὲ εἰς σύμματα ἐχώρεον καὶ ὄφεις καὶ κύνας, εἰπερ εἰσὶν ἀγέννητοι. Of these words

Justin Martyr.

to

to triumph, and, as if it had been a Sentence pronounc'd oracularly in his favour, he prints *ἐπιθήσειεν αὖτε ψαλὸν* in magnificent Characters. But if he pleases, he may do the same honour to that which follows, *viz. εἰς οὐρανὸν ἐξέλκεται, &c.* and then I am willing it should remain a Monument, either of his gross Fraud, or his supine Negligence: One of which is here unanswerably to be charg'd upon him. For whereas he would here deliver, and indeed

* See Epist. Disc. p. 33.

* professes actually to deliver, the words of the *Genius*, or good Old Man, who in this Dialogue acts the Instructor of *S. Justin*: The Passage above-cited is not spoken by the *Genius*, but by *S. Justin* himself, there acting the *Novice*, or the Stranger to Christianity. The *Novice* therefore determines nothing, but only asks the *Genius*, whether he now fell in with that Scheme of *Plato* in his *Timæus*, by which he does not ascribe an *ἀγνοία* to the Soul, as in his *Phædrus*, but a derivative *ἀσυνείδητος* only; *i. e.* such a Condition as was consistent with *Plato's* other Notions of the Soul, *viz.* its dying and being punished, and entring into Swine, Serpents, Dogs, &c. To prove what I here assert there needs only this following Translation of the words. *Is this therefore the*

Justin Martyr.

I 4

thing

thing which you would have, the same which Plato in his *Timæus* obscurely intimates ; when, speaking of the World, he says, that it is indeed corruptible, inasmuch as it once had a beginning, yet that by vertue of God's Pleasure it shall never be dissolv'd, nor be liable to the Fate of Death ? This very thing is what you seem to say of the Soul, and indeed all Beings whatsoever : implying that all things which are, or shall ever be, besides God, have a Nature that is corruptible, and are liable to be extinguish'd, and to Be no more. For God only is increate and incorruptible ; but besides him the rest are create and corruptible. 'Tis in consistence with this that Souls die, and are punish'd : because if they were increate, they would never sin ; neither would they enter willingly into Swine, Serpents, and Dogs, if indeed they were increate. Thus far the Novice, or the He who here personates a Stranger to Christianity ; yet as if there were not a Man in this Nation that could judge of Sense and Language, they are impos'd upon us by Mr. *Dodwel*, as the words of the *Genius*, or him who here personates the Instructor of that Novice. But he has committed this Cheat to very fine purpose. For to insist no longer on the Person who here speaks, what at length is the *English* of those

Justin Martyr.

pompous

pompous words *ἀποθνήσκουσιν αἱ ψυχαὶ καὶ πολεζόνται?*
 Why, *that Souls die, and are punish'd*; by
 which he might in general have concluded,
 that by dying is not here understood a
 State of Extinction, but of Misery. But
 he might farther have observ'd, that they
 who talk of this Death of Souls, talk
 likewise of their entring into Swine and
 Dogs; and that therefore this is only the
 Platonic Death of Souls, viz. their con-
 demnation to be thrust into Bodies, parti-
 cularly those of a disagreeable and odious
 sort. For a large account of this, we are
 to consult *Macrobius*, in his Comment on
 the *Somnium Scipionis*. 'Tis there in his
 11th Chapter that he tells us, *Qui primum*
Pythagoram, & qui postea Platonem secuti
sunt, duas esse mortes, unam animæ, anima-
lis alteram prodiderunt: Mori animal cum
anima discedit e corpore, ipsam vero animam
mori asserentes, cum, a simplici & individuo
fonte Naturæ, in membra corporea dissipatur;
 or as he afterwards expresses it, *cum in*
Corpus truditur. Such was the Platonic and
 the Pythagorean Death of Souls; and the
 whole Doctrine of the Antients on that
 Head, was comprehended, as *Macrobius*
 tells us, in that short Sentence of *Cicero*:
Hi vivunt qui e corporum vinculis tanquam
e carcere evolaverunt, vestra vero quæ dicitur

Justin Martyr.

esse

esse Vita, Mors est. But by how wretched a complication of Fraud and Blunder is this mystic Death of Souls now obtruded upon us, as their actual Annihilation; and this too, as taught by one of the purest and most primitive of the Christian Fathers?

16. 'Twas from his Mistake of this Passage, and another of the same Father, which I shall now cite from *Leontius*, that the nonsensical and tedious *Gobar*, not distinguishing either Persons, Words, or Things, took occasion to reflect upon *Justin Martyr*, as inconsistent with himself, and as derogating too much from the Immortality of Intellectual Beings, which in other places, he owns, he had effectually establish'd. On this occasion therefore *Photius* opportunely interpos'd, and justified the good Father from the Aspersions of the Heretic. But who would think that Mr. *Dodwel* should inherit the Shame of that contemptible Author, by the like Abuse and Misrepresentation of the same Father's Opinions; pretending that he has blam'd *Plato* for asserting our Doctrine of the Soul's natural Immortality? Yet S. *Justin* blames that Philosopher, not for this, but for asserting to the Soul much more than Immortality; that is, an *ἀναιμία*, or such

Justin Martyr.

an

an Immortality as excludes a Beginning as well as End. This Doctrine of *Plato* in his *Phædrus*, *St. Justin* and *Tertullian*, (as before observ'd) and all Christians do indeed abhor. But as for that Immortality of the Soul, which implies only its never having any End, this (as shall presently be shewn) *St. Justin* esteems a clear Philosophical Truth rightly taught by *Plato*, and confirm'd only, but not first reveal'd, by our Saviour. As to the manner indeed even of this Orthodox Immortality, he differs likewise from *Plato* in his *Timæus*: Yet he there differs from him, not for ours, but for *Mr. Dodwel's* Doctrine; i. e. for founding this Immortality on the bare Pleasure of God, rather than on a Law of Nature. This is seen in a Fragment of *St. Justin*, preserv'd luckily by *Leontius*; where though the Occasion and Context of the words is intirely lost, yet we may observe the whole Passage turns upon this, as an establish'd Axiom, *that Mankind is*

*indued with a * natural Principle of Immortality.* But this, says *S. Justin*, could not be, if (as some pretend) *νέματι μόνον τ'*

* His words are, Ἡ ἡμετέρα ὁμοίαν ζωὴν προσπλάκυσσε τῷ τῷ ὁδοῦν διέταξεν, ἀφανίζουσα μὲν τῷ ὁδοῦν, ἀδύνατον δ' εἶναι λοιπὸν τὸ διέταξεν διατηρεῖται. *Grab. Specil. Sec. 2. 172.*

ἀνάλογον ἡμῶν ἀποκαίλυσεν, i. e. if God skreen'd us

Justin Martyr.

from

from Death by his bare Pleasure only. Yet the misunderstanding these Passages, in which (as *Photius* tells us) τῷ Μάρτυρι πρὸς τῷ ἑλληνικῷ λόγῳ δόξαν συνενήνατο μάχη, i. e. in which the Martyr maintain'd a Dispute against an Heathenish Hypothesis, occasion'd Gobar of old, as it has now occasion'd Mr. *Dodwel*, to traduce *Justin Martyr* for a favourer of the very thing he was there opposing, viz. the Soul's natural Mortality. What reason therefore can be here alleg'd why I should not make *Photius* once more a Judge betwixt the Heretic and the Father; and changing the bare name, read now against Mr. *Dodwel* the Sentence pronounced against Gobar by that Learned Author? viz.

* Vid. Photium in Steph. Gobaro, cod. 232. col. 900.

* Ὁ δὲ Γόβαρος τὴν ἑλληνικὴν ἔλεγχον εἰς ἀναλεσπῶν ἐκβιάζεται χρῆμα τὴν θεολογίαν ἐκκλησιαστικῇ. i. e.

Gobar strains himself to use this disproof of the Heathen Writer, for reversing the Opinion of the Church.

17. With this Instance, which I think comes home to our modern misrepresenter of *Justin Martyr*, I shall close all I have to say, in answer to what he alleges from a short Episode of that Father, that so he might shelter himself under a great, but forc'd, Authority for the natural Mortality of the Soul. I only add, that every thing

Justin Martyr.

he

he produces from that *Episode*, is there put into the mouth of a *Genius*, or an Inhabitant of the other World; and therefore if it did indeed sound something unusual (which yet it does not appear to do) this however were not to be wondred at. For *Genii*, and *Dæmons*, and *superlunary Beings*, may well be introduc'd speaking a Language proper to themselves, while the Truths which they assert are at the same time common to them and us. Such a difference of expression cannot indeed infer any difference of the thing; nor would any one be so absurd as to pretend, that because they are two distinct Names, they must therefore necessarily be two Rivers;

Which the Gods Xanthus, Men Scamander call.

But this was only the first part of my Design, *viz.* to deprive Mr. *Dodwel* of all the Assistance and Authority he pretends from *Justin Martyr*. I now farther engage to bring in the same Learned Father as a Judge of this whole Controversy, interposing his definitive Sentence, and condemning very expressly these Innovations of Mr. *Dodwel*. And this I shall do, not from any foreign piece accidentally interwoven

Justin Martyr.

woven into the Father's Works, not from the Language of a *Spectre*, nor from any confus'd account of the Heathen Debates upon the Soul : but I shall produce the sedate Reasoning of *Justin Martyr*, deliver'd while he is handling this very Subject, and while he is vindicating therein his own and the Church's Doctrine. Nay, I dare be so particular, as to ruine Mr. *Dodwel's* Hypothesis step by step, upon the Authority of *Justin Martyr* ; alleging his Testimony, not only that all Souls are actually Immortal, but that this is true Philosophically, as well as Christianly, speaking ; and that this Immortality is founded on the Laws of that Nature they receiv'd at their Creation, not on any new Indulgence or Pleasure of their Maker. The Proof of this I shall put upon the Issue of these following Enquiries.

18. *First*, Does Mr. *Dodwel* limit the Universality of the Resurrection and of Judgment, and that because he had before limited the Immortality of Human Souls, allowing it only to such Souls as shall be acquainted with the Gospel ? Does he do this very pompously, and plead the Authority of *Justin Martyr* for what he does ? But he is no less false in that Opinion, than injurious in this Appeal to *Justin Martyr*.

Justin Martyr.

Martyr.

Martyr. For *Justin Martyr* answers far otherwise for himself, and for the Church of Christ, alleging that the first Preachers of the Gospel had absolutely taught, among other things, the Immortality of *Human Soul*, not adding any restraint or Exception whatsoever.

(a) Ὡςπερ εἶς ἐνὸς στόματι καὶ (a) S. Justin. *ad Græcos*
μᾶς γλώττης . . . περὶ ἀνθρωπί- cohort. *Sec. 8. Ed. Ox.*

νης ψυχῆς ἀθανασίας, . . . ἀκολούθως καὶ συμφώνως ἀλλήλοις
ἐνίδεξαν ἡμᾶς, i. e. They have instructed us
with great Unanimity, Harmony and Con-
sistence to one another, concerning the Immor-
tality of Human Soul. In another place he
divides (b) all Mankind

(as usual) into good and (b) See Chap. 2. *Sec. 2.*

bad ; and thus tells us what was the Opi-
nion of himself, and all Christianity, con-
cerning their Eternal State. (c) Τῷ καλεῖσθαι

ἐν αἰσθήσει καὶ μὴ θάνατον ἔσθαι. (c) Just. *Apol. I. Sec. 28.*
τὰς τῶν ἀδίκων ψυχὰς, τὰς δὲ τῶν

σεβασίων ἀπειλαγμύρας τῶν πμωειῶν ἐν δίδραν, ποιηταῖς
καὶ φιλοσόφοις τὰ αὐτὰ λέγειν δόξουσι : i. e. We seem
to say the same that your Poets and Philo-
sophers have said, viz. that the Souls of the
Wicked Are, and are tormented sensibly af-
ter Death, but that those of the Vertuous
live happily out of the reach of all Punish-
ment. These Poets, I hope, did not talk
of the Immortality of some Souls only,

Justin Martyr.

whilst

whilst they consign'd all the rest to Annihilation. On the contrary, they speak of Death not as an Extinction, but as a Translation only to another Place; and to this Place they remit all without exception, according to the Doctrine of a very Learn'd Poet,

— *omnes animas Locus accipit ille.*

In a word, they believe what in the end of all our Creeds, we profess likewise to believe, *i. e.* an Everlasting Life; or the Life of the World to come. Nor do they there restrain the Phrase of *Life* to a State of Happiness, as Mr. *Dodwel* does, but they allow that title even to a State of Everlasting Misery: *Virgil* having express'd

(a) *Æn.* 6. v. 598.

(b) See *Pind.* *ol.* 1. *spor.* γ. and compare this with *Chap.* 2. *Señ.* 4.

the Damnation of *Tityus* by (a) *Immortale jecur*, and *Pindar* that of *Tantalus* by (b) *ἀπάλαμτον βίον*, *i. e.* a remediless and an endless Life.

19. But Secondly, Does Mr. *Dodwel* represent *Justin Martyr* not only as a denier of the Immortality of Human Soul, but as a blamer of that Doctrine in the *Platonic Philosophy*? Does he pretend (§. 27.) that even that restrain'd sense in which he allows the survival of the Soul, has no evi-

Justin Martyr.

dence

dence of Reason or Tradition ; and that it needs therefore the Revelation of the Gospel to recommend it to the Belief of Mankind ? But quite contrary to all this, *Justin Martyr* says expressly, that the Soul in general (without any manner of restriction) is Immortal : Nay farther, he looks upon this as a notorious Truth ; as a Principle so well establish'd by the best Sects of Heathen Philosophy ; that our Gospel, which asserts the same, has asserted nothing but what we knew before, and that whatever has been reveal'd to us, as extraordinary in the Life to come, relates not to the Perpetuity of the Soul, but only to the Resurrection of the Body. This Testimony has been happily preserv'd to us by *Joannes Damascenus*, in a large * Fragment which he reports from

* *Vid. Grab. Spicil. Sec. 2. Pag. 192.*

Justin Martyr, concerning the Resurrection.

—“Οπὴ μὲρ ψυχὴ ἀθάνατος ὄντι, τὸ δὲ σῶμα φθατέον, καὶ ἐκείνους ἀναζήσεις, ταῦτα . . . καὶ περὶ τῆς μεθεῖναι τὴν Ἀλήθειαν, ὅθεν Πυθαγόρου καὶ Πλάτωνος ἠκούμεθα. Ἐν ταῦτα ἔλεγον ὁ Σωτὴρ, καὶ μόνος τῇ ψυχῇ τὴν σωτηρίαν ἀγγαλίζετο, τί καὶ ἐμὴν ἡμῶν ἔφερε ὅθεν Πυθαγόρου καὶ Πλάτωνα καὶ τὴν τέτων χρόνον ; νῦν δὲ τὴν καὶ καὶ ξένων ἀγγαλίζομεθα ἡλθεν ἀνθρώποις ἐλπίδα. Ἐνδὲν δὲ ἀεὶ ἡ καὶ καὶ τὸ δὲ Θεὸν ὑποσχεσθῆς, μὴ τῇ ἀφθαρσίᾳ τῶν ἀφθαρσίᾳ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀλλὰ τὴν φθορὰν ἀφθαρσίᾳ ποιῶν. i. e.

Justin Martyr.

K

That

That the Soul is indeed Immortal, but the Body Mortal, and unable to revive again, is what we have heard, before we were instructed in the Truth, from Pythagoras and Plato. If therefore this were the Doctrine of our Saviour, and he has preach'd to us the survival of the Soul only ; what new thing has he discover'd to us, beyond Pythagoras and Plato, and the Sect of each ? But in reality he came as the Preacher to Mankind of a Hope that is new and strange indeed. For it must needs be accounted new and strange, if God shall be pleased to promise, not to secure Incorruption to Incorruption, but to make even Corruption become Incorruption. We may here observe, that when Justin Martyr compares the Soul with the Body, and not with God, he is no longer shy of calling it Immortal. On the other side, he glories in that Persuasion, as in a Truth he first learn'd from Heathen Philosophy, and which has been confirm'd indeed, but not discover'd by the Gospel. 'Tis from thence only that he takes occasion to magnify the Idea of its Immortality : And in Imitation of St. Paul, who calls the Body

1 Cor. 15. 50. * *φθαρτὸν*, i. e. Corruption it self, from its natural tendency to alteration ; S. Justin, on the contrary, gives the name of *ἀφθαρσία*, i. e. of Incorruption

Justin Martyr

ruption it self to the Soul of Man, from the natural unalterableness and permanency of its Condition.

20. But *Thirdly*, Does Mr. *Dodwell* all along distinguish betwixt the natural and actual Immortality of the Soul, pretending that the latter is indeed indulg'd, to those who are duly qualified, by a Covenant of Grace; but that Mankind in general has no title to the former by any Law or Virtue of their Creation? But *Justin Martyr*, in direct opposition to all this, allows in the Soul it self an inherent Principle of Immortality, and derives this Principle from no new Indulgence of the Creator, but from that alone by which the Soul first receiv'd its Nature. Such is the full Testimony of our *Martyr*, when, in his last mention'd Treatise concerning the Resurrection, he urges the reasonableness of God's perpetuating the Bodies, as well as the Souls of Men. To his Arguments on this Head, he introduces

some Persons (a) (the *Marcionites* no doubt) replying in these words,

(b) Ἀλλ' ἡ ψὺς ψυχὴ ὅτιν ἀφ-
θαρίθ. μέρθ. ἔσθ' οὐ θεί, καὶ
ἐμψύκημα. καὶ διὰ τὸ τοιοῦτον
καὶ συγγένει· ἡ δὲ ἀθάνατος οὐσα· ἡ δ'

(a) Marcion in totum car-
nis Resurrectionem non ad-
mitrens, soli animæ salu-
tem repromittit. Tertul.
adv. Marcion: lib. 3.
cap. 10. Iren. lib. 1. c. 16.

(b) Vid. Spicileg. præ-
dict. pag. 189.

Justin Martyr.

K 2

• 189

οὐκ ἐφαρτή, καὶ ἐκ αὐτῶν, καὶ δὲ ἡ ψυχὴ. i. e.
 True, say they, but there is a difference be-
 twixt the Body and the Soul; for, *The Soul*
is indeed Immortal, in as much as it is a
part, and an inspiration of God himself. And
for that reason he has been pleas'd to perpe-
tuate that which is his own, and a kin to
him. But the Body is Mortal, as not being,
like the Soul, from God himself. Now in
 return to this Reasoning of theirs, the
 Martyr admits the Truth of their Sugge-
 stion, but retorts the Inference to be made
 from thence after this manner: ἔτι τις αὐτῶν
 χάρις; καὶ τίς ἐπιδείξει τὴν χρυσότητάν καὶ δυνάμειν αὐτῶν,
 αἰ τὸ μὲν φύσει σωζόμενον καὶ μέρους ὑπάρχον αὐτῶν σώζειν
 ἐμμελεν; Αὐτὸ γὰρ ὅτι αὐτῶν ἔχει τὴν σπουδαίαν ὥστε τὴν
 μὲν ψυχὴν σώζων ὃ μέγα πρᾶξι. Τὸ γὰρ σώζοντος πέρας
 αὐτῆς ὅτι ὅτι αὐτῶν μέρους, ἐμμελεν αὐτῶν ἔσται. i. e.
What Thanks therefore is hence due to God?
And how is this any demonstration of his
Goodness and Power; if he is like to perpe-
tuate that which is a part of himself, and is
of its own nature perpetual? For this has a
perpetuity from it self: So that he who would
perpetuate the Soul, does in effect no great
matter. For the privilege of perpetuity is
what belongs to the Soul, because it is a part
of God, as being his own inspiration. These
 are such plain Expressions, that they are
 not to be evaded, but by that which will

Justin Martyr.

be

be esteem'd a farther Evidence of a weak and defenceless Cause : and that is Mr. *Dodwel's* quarrelling with an * Author of the Greek Church, who wrote about a Thousand Years ago, and who has preserv'd these notorious Passages of *Justin Martyr*, to the utter ruin and subversion of his whole *Hypothesis*. But this is a mean Refuge, which he may observe I have purposely declin'd ; and therefore in our whole Dispute I have made no mention of a Book, which in the Year 1700, was Publish'd under this following Title ; *Justini Martyris cum Tryphone Judæo Dialogus secundum regulas criticas examinatus, & notiones convictus, Opera Christiani Gottlieb Koch*.

* *Joan. Damascenus*, who Transcrib'd to much of *S. Justin de Resurrectione*, it is said soon after the Year 700, and *Methodius*, who cites the same, before the Year 300.

21. But not disputing the Authority of that famous Dialogue, I shall at length repeat the Question, upon which this whole appeal to Antiquity is form'd : viz. *Whether the Soul of Man was created by God an Immortal Substance, and of such a Nature, as needs not any new Indulgence of its Creator, that it might live for ever*. And submitting this to be compar'd with the several Passages I have above answer'd or alleg'd, I desire it may be well consider'd,

Justin Martyr,

K 3

whether

whether the Man who has strain'd so many Sentences, and dissembled as many others, to make *Justin Martyr* a Witness for the negative of this Question, has discover'd any just regard to Truth and Reason, or at least any due degree of Reverence to so great a Saint, and Father of the Church. But if I have insisted too tediously on the Vindication of this Author, being induc'd thereto by his own venerable Character, as well as by that vulgar Opinion, which has in some measure conspir'd with Mr. *Dodwel*, 'twill however be one good step to the easier and shorter Examination of all his following Authorities. The next therefore to which he has appeal'd is

Tatian.

Now this is an Author which Mr. *Dodwel* has thought fit to introduce in company of Saints, and Martyrs, and Fathers of the Church. But he might much better have lain hid among his conceal'd Authorities, such as *Socinus* and *Gobar*, and some others which I shall hereafter mention. For *Tatian* has been the Father of nothing else, but a pestilent and wicked Heresy, famous among other things for damning the two First Parents of Mankind, as Mr. *Dodwel* has since been for damning or annihilating almost

almost all their Posterity. He once gloried in being the Disciple of *Justin Martyr*, as a certain Author has since done in being the Disciple of Bishop *Pearson* : but after his Master's Death, taking occasion (says (a) *S. Irenæus*) to separate from the Church, affecting a singularity, and being puffed with an Ambition of founding a Sect after his own Name; he wrote a confus'd (a) Book, in which he fram'd an *Hypothesis* of (b) two Spirits : a lower Spirit in some Men, by which they become barely (c) *Psychical* ; and an higher Spirit in others, by which they are made (d) *Pneumatical*. On this bottom he proceeded to claim an Immortality of Soul to his own Party, but denied it to the rest of all Mankind ; disguising his Book with an appearance of some Christian Truths, together with (that which was his peculiar Talent) a shew of Antiquity and Chronology ; but all this while concealing the Name of *Valentinus*; and other *Gnostics* from whom the whole was borrow'd. From this Book Mr. *Dodwel* has transcrib'd several Passages which

(a) Ἀντλέγουσι τὴν αὐτὴν ἀρετὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἁμαρτίαν. Τατιάνα πρὸς τὸν Πρωτόκλητον ἐπὶ τῇ βλασφημίᾳ. &c. Lib. I. cap. 30, 31. ἢ καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν βλασφημίαν ἔχοντες τὴν αὐτὴν διδόντες τῇ Τατιάνῃ. Epiph. Hær. 46. (b) See Tatian Edit. Oxon. Sess. 18. (c) Sess. 27. (d) Sess. 22.

he would palm upon us as so many Evidences of his Immortalizing Baptifmal Spirit. But when they are once read in the Book it self, or when they are duly interpreted by the Scheme which here follows of *Tatian's* whole *Hypothesis*, they will be found to look quite another way ; and will leave indeed to Mr. *Dodwel*, a full measure of the Scandal, but not the least Advantage, of the Parallel. For *Tatian* supposes the Soul (or that which God gave to Man in his Creation, distinct from his Bodily part) not to be a (e) single but a compounded Principle. The Ingredients of this Principle he makes to be a (f) two-fold Spirit, the one dependent on Matter, which he calls $\psi\chi\eta$ or $\piνεῦμα \upsilonλικόν$, the other superior to Matter, which he sometimes calls simply $\piνεῦμα$, and sometimes (g) $\piνεῦμα τέλειον$. Now each of these Spirits *Tatian* declares to have been an (h) ingredient Principle in the Frame of Man ; so that our First Parents had in the lower

(e) $\Psi\chi\eta$ ἓν ἢ ἓξ ἀνθρώπων πολυμερές ὅτι καὶ ἡ μοτομερές.
Señ. 24. (f) Δύο πνεύματων διαφορὰς ἴσμεν ἡμεῖς, ὃν τὸ μὲν καλεῖται $\psi\chi\eta$. τὸ δὲ μείζον μὲν τὸ $\psi\chi\eta$. (g) *Señ. 34.*
 (d) Ἐκείνα δὲ τὰ πνεύματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τοῖς πρώτοις ἐπέβηεν ἵνα τὸ μὲν πᾶσι ὡς ὕλη, τὸ δὲ ἀνώτερον τὸ ὕλη. *Señ. 18.*
 And again, γέγονε μὲν ἓν συνδύαλον ἀρχῆθεν τὸ πνεῦμα τῇ $\psi\chi\eta$. *Señ. 22.*

Tatian.

Spirit

Spirit a Principle of natural Life, and in the superiour one, (i) a Principle of Immortality. But he proceeds to imagin that in the Fall of Man, the (k) Soul lost that chief ingredient of its Nature, viz. the πνεῦμα τέλειον, or the superiour Spirit; and so being now nothing but the remains of a Soul, or that lower Spirit which was the meaner ingredient of its first composition, 'tis therefore Mortal, according to *Tatian*, in all the ordinary Posterity of *Adam*. But because he was duly conscious how great a Blow this gave to the chief Articles of the Christian Faith, particularly the Universality of the Resurrection and Judgment, and the undeniable Eternity of Rewards and Punishments, he therefore solves all this, by supposing that the Soul (l) is to rise together with the Body, and so all

(i) Λόγῳ γὰρ ἐπεράνιῳ εἰκόνα τ' ἀθανασίας τ' ἀνθρώπου ἐποίησεν, ἵνα ὡσπερ ἡ ἀφθαρσία ὡρθε τῷ Θεῷ, τ' αὐτὸν τρέπον Θεὸν μοῖραν ἀνθρώπου μεταλαβὼν ἔχη καὶ τὸ ἀθάνατον. *Secl.* 10. (k) Πτέρωσις γὰρ ἡ τ' ψυχῆς τὸ πνεῦμα τέλειον, ἐπερ ἀπορρίψατα διὰ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν . . . χαμαιπτιῆς ἐγένετο. *Secl.* 34. And before, 'Ο καὶ εἰκόνα τοῦ Θεοῦ μένους χειρὶν τοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πνεύματος δυνατοῦ. θνήσκει γίνεσθαι. *Secl.* 11. (l) Θνήσκει μὲν καὶ λύεται μετὰ τοῦ σώματος, ὥστε ἀνίστασθαι ἢ ὑστερον ἐπὶ συνέλευσιν τοῦ κόσμου σὺν τῷ σώματι θάνατον διὰ πτωρίας ἐν ἀθανασίᾳ λαμβάνουσα. *Secl.* 21.

Mankind to enter into a full unalterable (m) Immortality, either of Happiness or Misery.

22. See here an *Hypothesis* wild and Heretical enough, and which therefore is a Condemnation of Mr. *Dodwel*, even for his bare endeavour to draw it to his design. But he may please to observe these following differences betwixt his own and *Tatian's* Heresy. Does Mr. *Dodwel* positively deny, that the First Man was endued, by virtue of his Creation, with an inherent Principle of Immortality? But *Tatian* on the contrary affirms, that our first Parents were created of an Immortal Nature; though he fancies that they lost the Principle, by which their Nature was Immortal, in the Fall. Does Mr. *Dodwel* believe all Human Souls to subsist betwixt the time of Death and Judgment, though in a praternatural unaccountable manner of his own inventing? But *Tatian* pretends that all Souls either die, or as he strangely distinguishes it, are dissolv'd during that whole interval. Lastly, Does Mr. *Dodwel* suppose all Souls, that have

(m) Ἡμεῖς οἷς τὸ θνήσκον ῥαδίως ἀποβαίνει. νῦν, εἰς αὐτῆς ἢ μετ' ἀπολεύσεως τὸ ἀθάνατον, ἢ τὸ λυπηρὸν μετ' ἀθανασίας περιλαμβάνομεν. *See* 24.

liv'd in this World under an absolute Ignorance of the Gospel, lapsing, at the approach of Judgment, into actual Death; and so unconcern'd in any reunion with the Body, in the Sentence of the last Judgment, or the Eternity of the Life to come? But *Tatian*, bold and assuming Heretic as he was, yet dreaded the thoughts of so insufferable an Innovation, and therefore pretended to believe the restitution of the whole Man; that so he might fall in with the Church in the absolute Resurrection of all Bodies, and in the endless survival of all Souls by a happy or unhappy Immortality. What Advantage has Mr. *Dodwel* now got by raking into such an Heresy, but the drawing on himself the Guilt, even where he has not the concurrence, of the Opinion? What is there in all this like his *Epist. Discourse*, besides the boldness, the obscurity and the inconsistency of the Scheme? Does not *Tatian* hold the Soul to be Mortal, where *He* allows it to be Immortal? Does not the same Heretic hold the Soul to be Immortal, where *He* would fancy it to be Mortal? He sees this difference indeed, and therefore calls the only Christian part of *Tatian's Hypothesis*, i. e. his accounting for the Eternity of Souls,

Tatian.

an

* See Epist. Disc.
Pag. 37.

an * *Human Reasoning*; fairly implying, by an over-
weening fondness for every
thing that sounds agreeable to himself, that
his Unphilosophical, Unchristian Doctrine
of the Death of Souls, can be nothing but
Divine.

23. There is yet a farther Guilt with
which I am here to charge him; and that
is his Slandering the Glorious *Justin Mar-
tyr*, while he represents his Doctrine as
agreeing with these Paradoxes of his Apo-
state Scholar. But there is an Author of
another sort, that writes indeed agreeably
both in Thoughts and Words to *Justin
Martyr*; and who having declar'd himself
very positively upon this Subject, will
therefore afford an ample confirmation of
all I have before said concerning the Opi-
nions of the Holy *Martyr*. This therefore
is the Father to whom Mr. *Dodwel* makes
his next Appeal, viz.

S. Irenæus.

'Tis now almost Twenty Years since Mr.
Dodwel, in his Dissertations on this Au-
thor, gave us a Sketch of his present *Hy-
pothesis*, concerning the Mortality of the
Soul; though not having at that time so
desperate

desperate a Turn to serve, he did not therefore carry it so far as he has now done. 'Twas * there

* Dissert. in Iren. 6. Sect. 19.

that he first observ'd a difference made by Ire-

næus betwixt the *πρωτὴ* and *πνεῦμα*: And this he would needs strain to an implication of that Father's supposing two Principles of Life, the one Natural and Mortal, viz. the *πρωτὴ*, the other Adscititious and Immortal, viz. the *πνεῦμα*. But 'tis remarkable, that this was then introduc'd under a complication of Mistakes, and such as too frequently attends these Discoveries of Mr. *Dodwel*. For in the first place, he founds this Observation upon one *Caius* (the Author of the 48th Book in *Photius*) being there suppos'd to be a Transcriber of S. *Irenæus*: whereas, if the Passage he means be indeed transcrib'd, 'tis from *Josephus*, and not from *Irenæus*. In the next place, to make his Discovery have any appearance of Reality, he is fain to put an Indignity upon *Photius*; suspecting that *Caius*, an Author which Mr. *Dodwel* never saw, had in his Book made use of the word *πρωτὴ*; but that *Photius*, out of meer unskilfulness, had chang'd it into *πνεῦμα*. But this unwarrantable insolent dealing both with Men and Things, while he strikes out

Irenæus.

one

one word and inserts another, because forsooth the first did not serve, but subvert his purpose, is happily corrected by Photius's own Account of *Caius*. He has there told us very luckily, that he transcribes this Passage ἀντὶς λέξισιν, i. e. in *Caius*'s own Words. And if after that Assurance, we could be so abusive as to tell him that he has given us πνεῦμα instead of πνοή; he is yet to be vindicated by a Circumstance (which it seems Mr. Dodwel's Criticism could not discern) viz. that the whole Sentence runs

* As τέταρτον, ὑποχέπτον, &c. See Phot. cod. 48. col. 35.

in the * Neuter Gender, and must therefore necessarily refer to πνεῦμα,

and not to πνοή.

24. This was no improper digression: since it leads us into the Plea he now renews in his *Epistolary Discourse*; alleging *Irenæus* as a Witness of the Soul's natural mortality, because He makes a distinction (says Mr. Dodwel Page 41.) between the πνοή ζωῆς and the πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν in the Greek of *Genesis*. Now there is no πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν in *Genesis*; and therefore, I suppose, he means a distinction betwixt πνοή ζωῆς in the Greek of *Genesis*, and πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν in the Language of St. Paul. And who, in the name of wonder, ever question'd this Distinction? It being no other, according to

Irenæus.

our

our present Father, than a Distinction betwixt the Soul of Man, and the Holy Ghost. To prove this, let any Person but look into *Irenæus*, lib. 5. cap. 12. the place from whence Mr. *Dodwel* urges this Distinction, and he will there find that by πνεῦμα this Father understands τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον, but that by πνοὴ he understands a πνίγμα, and therefore concludes with very good reason; Ἐπεὶ οὖν ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνοῦν ἐκ τοῦ πνιγμοῦ ἐστίν. Ἡ δὲ πνοὴ πνιγμοῦ ἐστίν, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα αἰώνιον, or (as, from the Passage of *Gobar* * above-cited, it undoubtedly should be read) τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα αἰώνιον: i. e. *There is a difference betwixt the Creature and the Creator. The πνοὴ or Flatus was therefore temporary, that is, it had a beginning; but the πνεῦμα or Spirit is eternal, that is, without beginning as well as without end. This may serve to correct one signal Abuse which Mr. Dodwel has here made of Irenæus's Distinction betwixt the Soul and Spirit. For in this place he clearly understands by Spirit, no other than the Holy Ghost. If in others he means by Spirit an ingredient, of any sort, in the Frame of Man, and as such to be distinguish'd from his Soul, Mr. Dodwel can make no advantage of that Distinction; because, whatsoever it was that Irenæus meant by Soul*

Irenæus.

and

and Spirit, I come now to produce three unanswerable Testimonies, of his believing both that Soul, and that Spirit, to be naturally immortal.

25. The First of these shall be taken from a Topick that was in common use with the Primitive Fathers, first started by S *Justin*, and from him copied by *Tertulian*, *Methodius*, and others, as well as by our present Author ; whereby they urge against the Heretics of their time, that

* See Sect. 12. the * *Resurrection must belong to the Flesh that has fall'n, but not to the Spirit, which can never fall.* *Irenæus's* words on this occasion must have the greater weight in our Debate, because

they are quoted from a (a) Chapter which bears this express Title. *Resurrectio*

nobis promissa, ad Spiritus naturaliter immortales referri non debet, sed ad corpora ex se mortalia. Such is the Title of that Chapter ; and the words by which he makes it good, are a still ampler Attestation of his believing the Soul and Spirit of Man to be of their own nature immortal. He is there enquiring into the meaning of that Promise, *Rom. 8. 11. Ζωοποιήσιν τὰ θνητὰ σώματα ὑμῶν.* What (says he) would these Heretics here understand by *θνητὰ σώματα* ? *Ne mortalem*

Irenæus.

quidem

quidem possunt dicere ipsum flatum vite existentem. Et propter hoc David ait anima mea illi vivet, tanquam immortalis substantiæ ejus existente. Sed neq; spiritum possunt dicere mortale Corpus. Quid igitur superest dicere mortale Corpus, nisi plasma, id est, caro, de qua & sermo est ei, quoniam vivificabit eam Deus? Hæc enim est quæ moritur & solvitur, sed non Anima, neq; Spiritus. Mori enim est vitalem amittere habilitatem & sine spiramine in posterum & inanimalem & immobilem fieri, & deperire in illa ex quibus & initium substantiæ habuit. Hoc autem neq; animæ evenit; status enim est Vitæ: neq; spiritui; incompressus est enim & simplex Spiritus qui resolvi non potest. When a curious and learned Father shall thus nicely consider Death, both as it is an expiration and a dissolution, and then comparing these with the nature of Soul and Spirit, shall determine that they are both incapable of Death in either of those senses, with what Face is he now introduced by Mr. Dodwel, as a Teacher of the Soul's natural Mortality? But,

26. Secondly, For a farther Evidence, let us hear the same Father in a clear and decisive Passage, wherein he thus compares the Condition of Soul and Spirit, with that of the Body. * *Lib. 5. cap. 13.*

Irenæus.

L

gymnasium

αἰματισμὸς ὃ αὐτῆς, ἐπ' θνητῇ καὶ φθαρτῇ ἔσται, ἀθάνατος
καὶ ἀφθαρτός γίνεσθαι, ἐκ ἑξ' ἰδίαις ὑποστάσεως ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ
τῷ κυρίῳ ἐνέργειαν, τὸ δύνασθαι αὐτὸν τῷ θνητῷ τῷ ἀθανά-
τῳ καὶ τῷ φθαρτῷ ἀφθαρτοποιῆσαι τῷ ἀφθαρσίαν. Καὶ διὰ
τῆτο φησὶν· ἵνα καταπαθῇ τὸ θνητὸν καὶ τὸ ζῶν. Ὁ δὲ
κατεργασάμενος ἡμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τῆτο, Θεὸς, ὁ καὶ δὲς ἡμῖν τὸ
ἀρραβῶνα τῷ πνεύματι· φανερώμεθα καὶ τὴν σαρκεὶς ταῦτα
λέγων· ἔτι καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ θνητὸν, ἔτι τὸ πνεῦμα. i. e.

The Transfiguration of the Flesh consists in this, that being mortal and corruptible, it becomes immortal and incorruptible; not from its own substance, but according to the operation of the Lord, and his Power to invest that which is Mortal with Immortality, and that which is Corruptible with Incorruption. On this account 'tis said, that Mortality may be swallow'd up of Life. Now he that hath wrought us for the self-same thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit. Words which are most clearly spoken of the Flesh: For neither is the Soul a mortal Being, nor the Spirit. Mr. Dodwel was indeed conscious of these last words, when he had the front to allege Irenæus for the natural mortality of the Soul: and therefore he pretends to elude their force, by saying, they mean nothing else, but that the Soul does not actually die when the Body dies. But he is to know, that the Soul and Body are

Irenæus

here

here compar'd, not at the time of their dissolution, but of their reunion ; that time, when the Body which has fall'n shall be made as immortal as the Soul which never fell ; and so both enter from thence forward on their joint unalterable everlasting state. But,

27. *Thirdly, Irenæus* comes up more fully, if possible, to the terms of our present Question, and asserts the Soul to be a substance so absolutely Immortal, that it needs no second Indulgence of the Creator for its continuing for ever. And this I shall be so hardy as to prove from those very words, from which Mr. Dodwel would have prov'd the contrary. For (*pag. 39.*) being unable to dissemble those palpable Expressions of *Irenæus* concerning the Soul's natural Immortality, he has yet the Courage to interpret them of *his denying only the actual Death of the Soul, and his allowing all this while that Death is natural to it on account of its natural constitution.* For, so himself (says he) seems to explain himself, when speaking of the Immortality of the Soul and Spirit, he has these words ; perseverant Immortalia, quoniam vivificantur a Patre ; l. 5. c. 4. It is therefore the perseverance in Life, when the Body dies, that he means by the Soul's Immortality.

Irenæus.

L 2

And

And it is the extrinsecal favour of the Father, not its own nature, to which the Soul is beholden for that perseverance in Being, according to the Opinion of S. Irenæus. See here an Instance, from whence the World may hereafter judge of the Ability, and the Integrity, of Mr. Dodmel. See here a wilful Falsification of the plain, careful and repeated Expressions of the very Father whom he particularly professes to respect. But see farther how he supports this Falsification by a wretched blunder, unworthy of a Scholar, unworthy of an honest man. For if his Talent be indeed no greater in matters that require an exact Reasoning; with what Conscience does he thus rashly intermeddle in the very Fundamentals of Religion? *Irenæus* (says he very confidently) has these words, *Perseverant Immortalia, quoniam vivificantur a Patre*. And then he gravely proceeds to comment them to his own purpose. But here I desire it may be observ'd; 1. That these are not the words of *Irenæus*, but of the *Valentinian Heretics*, here introduc'd by *Irenæus* for no other end, but to be refuted by him. 2. The Father here mention'd is not the God and Maker of the Universe, but that unknown imaginary Father most blasphemously brought upon the

the
S.
in
*
bu
3-
as
be
of
th
2
D
m
fl
h
T
P
t
i
P
a
f
l
c

Irenæus.

the stage by those Heretics, and of which S. Irenæus has given a particular account in a Chapter that bears this express Title,

* *Quomodo incognitum omnibus inducere conantur Patrem.* * Lib. 1. cap. 16.

3. The words here offer'd by Mr. Dodwel as an intire sentence, are two distinct members of a much longer period; the latter of which is link'd by *Quoniam* to something not here recited: and this too, by *Quoniam* not signifying *because*, as Mr. Dodwel unskilfully supposes, but by *Quoniam* of the Gallic Latin, i. e. as it is translated from *¶*, both in this and in six hundred other places of the same Work. To prove all this, I need be at no other pains, but that of transcribing and translating the Passage which contains the words in question. And comparing this with a parallel Testimony before brought from Justin Martyr, it will I hope be esteem'd as their joint, final and decisive Sentence for the eternal survival of the Soul, not by any new Indulgence of its Creator, but by the Nature first bestow'd upon it in its Creation. Thus therefore begins our Author, lib. 5. cap. 4. *Latent autem semetipsos, qui alterum effingunt Patrem, præter Demiurgum, & bonum eum vocant, infirmum & inutilem & negligentem inferentes eum,*

Irenæus.

L 3

ut

ut non dicamus quoniam lividum & invidum, eo quod dicant non vivificari ab eo nostra corpora. Cum enim dicant ea quæ omnibus sunt manifesta quoniam perseverant immortalia, utputa spiritus & anima, & quæ sunt alia, quoniam vivificantur a Patre, illud autem quod non aliàs vivificatur nisi illi Deus præstet, vita derelinqui; aut impotentem & infirmum ostendit Patrem ipsorum, aut invidum & lividum. Demiurgo enim & hic vivificante mortalia corpora nostra & resurrectionem eis per Prophetas promittente; quis potentior & fortior & vere bonus ostenditur? Utrum Demiurgus qui totum vivificat hominem; an falso cognominatus ipsorum Pater? Qui ea quidem quæ sunt naturâ immortalia, quibus a suâ naturâ adest vivere, fingit se vivificare, quibus autem opus est, ab eo, adjutorio ut vivant, non vivificans illa benigne, sed relinquens illa negligenter in mortem. i. e. They know not what they do, who feign another Father besides the Maker of the World, and call him indeed Good, but make him by consequence both infirm and useless, not to say spiteful and envious, while they affirm that our Bodies are not enliven'd by Him. For while they affirm of those things which are plain to every one that they continue Immortal, as the Spirit, the Soul, and the rest of that

kind, that these are enliven'd by the Father, but that the Being which is not otherwise enliven'd than as God affords it Life, is deserted by Him; this either represents their Father as infirm and useless, or else as (a) spiteful and envious. For while God, the Maker of the World, is by us confess'd to enliven our mortal Bodies, and to promise them a Resurrection by the Prophets; Which is it that is represented truly Good? Which the more powerful, and the stronger of the two? Whether the Maker who enlivens the whole Man, or He whom they falsely surname their Father? He, who pretends forsooth to enliven those things which are naturally Immortal, things to which Life of their own nature (b) belongs; but those things which (c) need an assistance from him, that they may live, these he does not kindly enliven, but leaves them negligently to Death. The Reader will here pity the unfortunate Industry of Mr. Dodwel, who when he thought he had urg'd the Opinion of a Saint and Father, did indeed adopt into his Hypothesis the words of an infamous

(a) The Thoughts and Words of Justin Martyr are strictly parallel, Ἡ φθορεὶς τοῦ σώματος & σώματος. And again, Ἡ ἀφαιρέσις τῆς ζωῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος & σώματος. Spirit. Sec. 2. Pag. 189. (b) Σὺ ζῶντι πνεύματι ζῶντι. Ibid.

and notorious Heresy ; having thus erected with his own hands, one very stately monument of the Charge I have brought against him.

28. But no wonder that Mr. *Dodwel* was soon betray'd into this shameful Error, who begun his whole account of *Irenæus*, with the like unpardonable misrepresentation. *Irenæus* (says he p. 38.) admits the Reasoning which St. Austin did, that whatever was *γεννηθῆναι* must be *φθαρτὸν*, and therefore allows nothing to be ingenerable and incorruptible but God. If indeed it be St. Austin's Reasoning, what assistance does Mr. *Dodwel* expect from thence, who on this Subject thinks and writes in express Contradiction to St. Austin ? But omitting this, will not our *Dissertator* on *Irenæus* blush, when instead of allowing that whatever was *γεννηθῆναι* must be *φθαρτὸν*, he shall find *Irenæus* laboriously and at large asserting, that what was *γεννηθῆναι* must not necessarily be *φθαρτὸν* ? Does not Mr. *Dodwel*, with shame, remember the Title of that * very Chapter which he would

* *Lib. 2. cap. 64.*

quote on this occasion ; viz.

Quomodo Animæ cum sint generabiles, in futurum incorruptibiles permaneant ? Was not that Chapter wrote against this very Reasoning, which, by a barefac'd Falshood,

Irenæus.

he

he pretends *Irenæus* did admit? *Siqui hoc loco dicant* (says S. *Irenæus*) *non posse animas eas quæ paulo ante esse cæperint in multum temporis perseverare, sed oportere eas innascibiles esse ut sint immortales... discant quomodo sine initio & sine fine vere & semper idem & eodem modo se habens solus est Deus, &c.* What is this but an asserting to God, after the Pattern of *Justin Martyr*, that Immortality which has neither End nor Beginning; and to the Soul, that Immortality which had indeed a Beginning, but nevertheless shall never have an End? Far therefore from admitting that what is *ἀνίκητος* must therefore be *φθαρτός*, *Irenæus* thought it necessary to oppose that Principle (a) receiv'd in his time among the Hea-then *Platonists*: and so he left no Objection against the Immortality of the Soul, from the Christians confessing it to be *ἀνίκητος*. Nor was this only proper to *Irenæus*, but was a Topic, as common as 'twas necessary, in an Age that so much studied the *Platonic* System; accordingly we find (b) *Methodius* careful of satisfying the same Suggestion, and arguing that there is no necessity of supposing a Being corruptible, because it

(a) Ἐπιμνησθὲν γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀφθαρτὸν οὐκ ἔστι.
Plat. in *Timæo*.

(b) *Methodius* in *Ephesian*. p. 553.

Irenæus.

is

is not pretended to be ingenerable. But if without distinguishing things and persons, Mr. *Dodwel* can give us that for the Opinion of this Father, which is inserted only in his Works, as the Heretical Opinion he refutes, he would do well in his following Dissertations, to confine his Pains to meer matters of Fact and History ; but not to expose himself, nor to injure *Irenæus* for the future, by such Reasonings as these.

29. What he adds from this Father, concerning the notion of a *Perfect* Man, is a groundless Suggestion. He would insinuate, that this Perfect Man being made such by an union with an adscititious Spirit, is therefore the sole pretender to an Immortal Soul ; but that the rest of Mankind being destitute of this Spirit, and consequently of this adscititious Perfection, remain liable, in Soul as well as Body, to an actual Death. But the Perfection here spoke of by S. *Irenæus*, is a Perfection of Grace, and not of Nature ; and consequently the Immortality to which Man is thereby entitl'd, is the *Immortality of Happiness*, and not of *Being*.

* *Memoires Ecclesiastiques*
du *Sieur D. T.* Tom. 3.
Part 1. pag. 446. Edit.
Brux.

Irenæus.

Such is the Distinction by which the
* *Sieur D. T.* has rightly answer'd Monsieur
Du Pin, and others,
who

who from some Expressions of *Irenæus* concerning the gaining or losing of an Immortality, had thought him, in some sense, favourable to the Annihilation of wicked Souls. And this he unanswerably confirms by observing, that the Immortality, suppos'd by *Irenæus* to be gain'd or lost, is that which consists in the Privilege of (a) seeing God. If the Immortality of Being is any where mention'd by *Irenæus*, as that which Man may forfeit by his Ingratitude, 'tis only to assert God's Power of destroying any perverse Workmanship of his own, if he pleases to interpose, and to withdraw that general concurrence by which he supports all things, whether in themselves corruptible, or incorruptible. If farther, the same Immortality is any where implied to be given by God to Man; 'tis meant either of the same ordinary concurrence in the conservation of all his Creatures, or else of that original Gift, by which he made (b) Immortality natural to the Soul in its first production. The Soul

(a) See *Irenæus* largely to this purpose, lib. 4. c. 30. & 75. and taking his hint from *Wisd.* 6. 19. "Ομοίως δὲ καὶ τῶν ποιητῶν ἀφθαρσίαν. (b) So *Methodius* in *Epiphanius*, pag. 553. Ἀθάνατον γὰρ ταῦτα, καὶ ἀδύνατον, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἵνα βεβήληται.

not being from it self, its Immortality and all its Properties were indeed given it by God. But then this was so given, that thence-forward it might properly be call'd its own. For that such a right as this is not inconsistent with the nature of a Gift, is implied by that expression of the Evangelist, *Τὸ ὑμῖν δοθέν ἐστὶν ὑμῶν ἑαυτοῦ*; i. e. *Who shall give you that which is your own?* But 'tis not my business to account for any ambiguities of *S. Irenæus*: I shall observe only that by an Equity due to Him, in common with Authors of a far less Character than that of Saints, his Ambiguities are to be explain'd by his other ample declarations of his Sentiments, when handling the point in Question. Three of this sort I have now urg'd from *Irenæus*, concerning the natural Immortality of the Soul: And if Mr. *Dodwel* will needs reverse these by any ambiguous Expression, accidentally dropt when *Irenæus* was not thinking of this Subject, no wonder that he has fall'n into such gross Blunders, as were worthy of that sacrilegious attempt.

30. After a manifest depravation of two such venerable Authorities as those of *S. Irenæus*, and *S. Justin Martyr*, the Reader will come with the less surprize, to the

Irenæus.

next

next Author He has alleg'd, viz. the excellent

Athenagoras.

For pretending, with the same degree of Confidence, to the Suffrage of this Author for the natural Mortality of the Soul, Mr. *Dodwel* has produc'd a Sentence here recited in the (a) Margin, which with any competent Judge amounts to no more than this; viz. a Supposition that the Soul is confessedly to continue for ever; and an Argument, that the whole Man, in Body as well as Soul, is to be believ'd of the same continuance. One would wonder what had befall'n a Man of Parts and Learning, that he should thus unthinkingly go about to confirm his Hypothesis by Testimonies that subvert it. For though this is not the first Sentence that I would quote from *Athenagoras*, for the Immortality of the Soul; yet has it apparently no meaning, if the Soul is not suppos'd Immortal. But in truth, that Author's whole Treatise concerning the Resurrection, turns upon this very Principle, and abounds with so

(a) Ὁ δὲ καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν λόγον δεξιόμην ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπου, ὃ καὶ καὶ αὐτῷ. Ἀθανάσιος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ἡ ἀμφοτέρων ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸν εἰς αἰῶνα. *Athenag. de Resur. Mort. Ed. Oxon. Pag. 236.*

many

many emphatical Assertions that the Soul was created of an Immortal Nature, that the picking, out of the middle of all these, a few words, which he thought look'd another way, will reflect very hardly upon the Intention, or the Understanding of Mr. *Dodwel*. But the Authorities he has so industriously conceal'd, I shall now set before him in this following order.

31. In the first place *Athenagoras* expresses the two parts of our Constitution by (a) φθαρτὸν ἀσθάρτω συνόν, i. e. a corruptible part in conjunction with an incorruptible one. In the next place he takes it for granted, by all those who look not upon Death as an intire Extinction, that the Soul remains by it self, after its separation from the Body, not liable to Dissolution, Dispersion or Corruption: His words are (b) μένει καὶ αὐτῷ ἄλλῳ ἢ ψυχῇ ἀσπένδαντος, ἀδιάρρηκτου. But because Mr. *Dodwel* has an unreasonable Reply to this, and the like Testimony of those Primitive Times, pretending that 'tis to be understood of what he calls an actual and adscititious Immortality; *Athenagoras* therefore has obviated that novel thought, by asserting to the Soul a natural and original Immortality, belonging to it by

(a) P. 207. (b) P. 259, 25c.

Athenagoras.

God's Grant and Warrant in the Creation of Mankind. (c) Τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἐπισκοπῆς εἶναι,

τὴν τε μετ' ἐνδείας καὶ φθορᾶς ζωὴν εἰσγυμῶν, ὡς τὴν παρ' ἐν-
βίῳ περιήκουσιν, καὶ τὴν ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ διαμονὴν ἐλπίζουσαν
βεβαίως. ἣν ἡ περ' ἀνθρώπων ἀναστροφὴ ματρὶ, ἡ δὲ
δύσιν ἑαυτῶν βεβηλῶντες ἐλπίζουν. ἀσπασπῆται δὲ πᾶσι
καὶ ἐχθροὶ, τῇ τῷ δημιουργῶσι. ἡμεῖς γινώσκοντες, καὶ
ἡ ἐποίησεν ἄνθρωπον ἐκ ψυχῆς ἀθάνατης καὶ σώματος. i. e.

If we look into our own nature, it will be found that we have a natural Affection to our corruptible and needy Life, as belonging to this temporary condition; and that we firmly expect a Perpetuity that is incorruptible: A Perpetuity which we do not fondly frame upon Human Authority, deluding our selves with any groundless hopes, but which we believe upon a most unerring Warrant, even the Decree of him who made us, and who created Man of a Body, and an Immortal Soul. A more peremptory and more authentic Testimony, that the Soul is Immortal by vertue of its first Creation, will not surely be expected. Yet after all, because by that infallible characteristic of Schism and Heresy, that arrogance of engrossing all the Privileges of the other World, Mr. Dodwel will needs restrain this Immortality to what he calls God's *Peculium*; He

(c) R. 223.

Athenagoras.

is therefore drove even from that ultimate refuge of Pride and Singularity, by the like careful Expressions of *Athenagoras*. For he argues from it as from an uncontestable Supposition, that not any peculiar People, but (d) *πάντα κοινῶς ἢ πῶς ἀνθρώπων φύσις ἐν ψυχῇ ἀθανάτου καὶ . . . σώματος ἔχει τῶν σῶσεων*, i. e. *the whole Race of Mankind in common, is constituted of a Body and an Immortal Soul*. And when in a Reasoning of another sort, he compares our Nature with that of Angels, as those which in their whole Constitution are Immortal, he tells us that (e) *ἄνθρωποι καὶ τῶν ψυχῶν ἀπὸ γνώσεως* (and, as he before express'd it, *καὶ οὐκ ἐκ φύσιν*) *ἔχουσιν τῶν ἀμταβλήτων διαμονήν*, i. e. *that Men, (or all Mankind consider'd in opposition to Angelic Beings) as to their Soul, i. e. one part at least of their Constitution, have by vertue of their Creation, and according to their proper Nature, an unchangeable Perpetuity*. Thus shamefully is Mr. *Dodwel* now rebuk'd by another Judge of his own choosing, and by him taught hence-forward to imagine, that every one he meets in the shape and countenance of a Man is as Immortal as himself.

32. Proceed we therefore to the next

(d) P. 232. (e) P. 239.

Athenagoras.

Author

Author he would represent as a Teacher of the Soul's natural Mortality ; i. e. to

Theophilus Antiochenus.

And here, by the way, we are to observe, that this is not the first Injury he would have offer'd to this Author ; he having endeavour'd to assign the three Books *ad Autolyicum*, not to that *Theophilus* who was the Sixth Bishop of *Antioch*, but to another *Theophilus* of the same place, that wrote not before the Year 203. This Conceit has been well corrected by the *Sieur de Tillemont*, an Author in all other respects judicious enough, but very peculiar (as some Men may think) in his thoughts of Mr. *Dodwel*. He (a) frequently takes occasion to represent him, as a Man of little Solidity, fruitful of endless Imaginations and Conjectures, and one who delivers these in a manner that is very difficult to unravel. In that place more particularly where he restores this Book to the true *Theophilus*, he says, (b) *Voila surquoi, &c.* See upon what Grounds this New Writer belies Eusebius, and all other, as well Antient

(a) *Memoires du Sieur D. T. Tom. 2. Part 1. Pag. 453.*
 Also Part 2. Pag. 514. Edit. Brux. (b) *Tom. 3. Part 1.*
 pag. 433.

as Modern, Authors. Certainly Heads that are so rash, and so wrong turn'd, as to reason after this fashion, are not worthy of ever handling any Historical Matter. I leave it to others to consider, whether they are any fitter for handling matters of Divinity. Had Mr. Dodwel thought thus modestly of himself, he had then rais'd no unseasonable Dispute about that which is the first Fundamental Point in natural, as well as in reveal'd, Religion. But 'tis my business only to vindicate the Book, as 'twas that of *De Tillemont*, to vindicate its Author from these novel thoughts.

33. One would therefore gladly know, to what purpose Mr. *Dodwel* makes a long and incorrect recital of a Passage in this Work, that relates to the Condition of *Adam* before his Fall, and asserts (a) that

(a) Μίσος ὁ ἀνθρώπου ἐγγόνος ἔτε θνητὸς ὁλοκαυρῶς, ἔτε ἀθάνατος τὸ καθόλου, δικταδὸς ὃ ἐκατέρων. And again, Ἀλλὰ φήσιν ἔν πε ἡμῖν. θνητὸς φύσει ἐγένετο ὁ ἀνθρώπος; ἀδαμῶς. τί ἐν; ἀθάνατος; ἔδὲ τῷτο φαμέν. Ἀλλὰ ἐρεῖ τις, ἔδὲν ἐν ἐγένετο; ἔδὲ τῷτο. [ἐγὼ μὲν] ἔτε ἐν φύσει θνητὸς ἐγένετο, ἔτε ἀθάνατος. Ἐι γὰρ ἀθάνατον αὐτὸν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἐπιποιήκαμ, θεὸν αὐτὸν ἐπιποιήκαμ. Πάλιν, εἰ θνητὸν αὐτὸν ἐπιποιήκαμ, ἔδοκα ἂν ὁ Θεὸς αἶψα εἶναι τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ. ἔτε ἐν ἀθάνατον αὐτὸν ἐποίησαν, ἔτε μὲν θνητὸν, ἀλλὰ, καὶ τῶς ἐπάνω περιερέχον, δικταδὸν ἀμφοτέρων. Ὡς ῥεῖται ὅτι τὰ τ' ἀθανασίας πρέσας τῷ ἐξολωτῷ τῷ θεῷ. μὲν κομίσῃαι παρ' αὐτοῦ τῷ ἀθανασίᾳ, καὶ γένῃαι θεός. Ἐι δ' αὖτε τῷ ὅτι τὰ τῷ θανάτῳ περιγυμνασάμενος, τῷ θεῷ, αὐτὸς αὐτῷ αἶψα ἢ τῷ θανάτῳ. S. Theophil. ad Autol. lib. 2. pag. 134. Ὁ pag. 142. Edit. Oxon.

Theophilus

Man

Man was at first created neither naturally Mortal, nor naturally Immortal, but capable of either. This serves indeed, as generally his Quotations do, to bring him under a self-condemnation ; while he pleads the Testimony of this Father concerning Man's being created neither Mortal nor Immortal, yet affirms at the same time, that Man was absolutely created Mortal, throughout the whole strain of his Discourse. But when he copied that Doctrine, and the Reasons of it, from *Socinus*, in opposition to (b) *Justin Martyr*, (c) to *Tertullian*, (c) to *Methodius*, as well as to *Theophilus Antiochenus*, and the following Canons of the Church of *Africa*, he might have learnt from the (d) same Master, that the Mortality or Immortality of Man is a subject vastly different from the Mortality or Immortality of the Soul. Nay, without the assistance of *Socinus*, he might have consider'd, that the Mortality of Man relates to the separation of his Soul and Body, but the Mortality of the Soul to the ex-

(b) See *Just. Martyr* in the Fragment preserv'd by *Leon-
tius*. *Spic'l.* Sec. 2. pag. 172. (c) See *Methodius* in *Epi-
phanus*, pag. 541. and 547. And *Tertullian* to the same pur-
pose, *de Anima*, cap. 52. (d) See *Socinus's* Dispute *de*
Mortalitate primi Hominis, *Bibl. Polon.* Tom. 2, pag. 282, 283.
And his Letter above-cited, Chap. 2. Sect. 16.

tion of its Substance. The Soul therefore may undoubtedly have been created Immortal, though the Man were not ; and if Mr. *Dodwel* pleases to look into *Nemesis de natura Hominis*, he will (a) there observe so large and full an account of this middle State, in which *Adam* was at first created, and at the same time so clear and positive an assertion of the Soul's natural Immortality, as may persuade him that those Authors who maintain'd the first of these Doctrines, could yet infer nothing from thence to the prejudice of the second. And this I the rather mention, because the *Τελείωσις*, or the notion of the perfect Man, here urg'd by Mr. *Dodwel* from *Theophilus*, is in the same place so clearly handled by *Nemesis*, as may convince him that 'tis no evidence of his Immortalizing Adscitious Spirit.

34. Thus unhappy is Mr. *Dodwel*, when he wanders from his Subject. Let us see whether he is more successful when he keeps closer to it ; when he talks, I mean, of the Mortality now in question, *i. e.* the Mortality, not of *Man*, but of the *Soul*.

(a) Compare *Nemesis*, pag. 14. and 15. with himself, pag. 91, 92. Ed. Oxon.

To prove this from *Theophilus Antiachenns*, he urges him as quoting that Text (of Gen. 2. 7.) in which God is said to have breath'd into Man πνοὴν ζωῆς, and then adding, ὅθεν καὶ ἀθάνατος ἡ ψυχὴ ἀνόμασαι ὅτι τοῖς πολλοῖς : i. e. whence with most Men, the Soul has been stil'd Immortal. Were I to have produc'd an Evidence of the Soul's being believ'd Immortal, this is indeed one passage I should have us'd : but by what fetch would he now strain this to confirm the Opinion of its Mortality ? Why, because (says he pag. 47.) *Theophilus* plainly here implies, that he was not *himself* of the number of the *many* who thought the Soul Immortal. Now granting this to be a valid Inference, and that we must hereby lose the single Testimony of *Theophilus* ; yet this were a loss by which we should gain the Point in question, and prove the general Tradition of those Times to have been in favour of the Soul's natural Immortality. But in truth not only the *many* as they are here call'd, but *Theophilus* among the rest, was of this Opinion : And to prove this, I appeal to those other words of his, when, speaking of the whole Man as passing from the Resurrection into an incorruptible State, he says, (b) *Αναγίρει*

(b) Lib. 1. ad Autol. p. 22.

ἐν τῇ σάρτι, ἀθάνατον σὺν τῇ ψυχῇ, ὁ Θεός : i. e.
 (if I may explain as well as translate the
 words,) *God then raises thy Flesh, Immor-*
tal, as thy Soul has always been. For σὺν
 τῇ ψυχῇ relates not to ἀναγίρει but to ἀθάνατον.
Theophilus therefore was one of the οἱ πλεί-
 οντες, with whom the Soul was stil'd Immor-
 tal : and indeed that very manner of ex-
 pression implies as much. For Men of
 Sense and Reason would never think they
 derogated from any Truth by saying, it
 was the Opinion of the οἱ πλείονες : on the
 other side, that very word is the mark by
 which they generally signify a proposition
 to be naturally and unquestionably assent-
 ed to. And for the Proof of this, I think
 I can bring an Instance very proper to our
 present purpose, viz. that of *Tertullian de*
Resur. Carnis, cap. 3. Quædam naturæ nota
sunt ; ut Immortalitas animæ penes plures :
ut Deus noster penes omnes.

35. No Suffrage could more fortunately
 have concluded our account of *Theophilus*
Antiochenus, than this very Apposite one of

Tertullian.

For this is the very Author to which Mr.
Dodwel makes his next Appeal. Now 'tis
 impossible for any Writer to be more clear,
 more peremptory, and more constant to
 himself

himself in any Point, than *Tertullian* has been in the Immortality of the Soul. Not to insist on the above-cited words, by which I have now introduc'd him into this Cause, he professes that he has fully declar'd himself as to the whole Condition of the Soul; laying it down as his Ground-work, that it is Immortal. (a) *Habet iste a nobis plenissimum de omni statu animæ stilum, quam in primis immortalem tuentes, solius carnis defectionem agnoscimus.* In his Debates on the nature of the Soul he carefully excludes every (b) thing which may be thought to derogate from its Immortality: *this*, says he, *is what immortalitas animæ non sinit credi.* He considers all that *Plato* had advanc'd in honour of Human Soul, and (c) dissenting from him where he makes it more than Immortal, that is *innatam & infectam*, he (d) subscribes to him, in allowing it the fullest and noblest Immortality that can be consistent with a created Being. And after all, least these ample Testimonies should seem frustrated by any putid distinction betwixt a natural and an actual Immortality, *Tertullian* has

(a) *De Resur. cap. 2.* (b) *De Anima cap. 33. and 43.* (c) *Cap. 4. and 14.* (d) *Natam eam agnoscimus, ac per hoc dilutioris Divinitatis; not dilutioris Immortalitatis, as Mr. Dodwel groundlessly infers.*

pronounc'd Immortality natural to the Soul in these exprefs terms : (a) *Licebit Anima dilapsâ domo, incolumi abire, habenti sua firmamenta, & propriæ conditionis alimenta, Immortalitatem, Rationalitatem, &c.* and then adding some other Properties, he affirms all these to be *nativitûs Animæ conlata*. To Evidences so full and so positive as these, I need not at length add that admirable Form of Confession in his Book *de Testimonio Animæ*, where not having any Schismatical regard to the Souls of the *Peculium*, not restraining his Discourse to Souls acquainted with the Gospel, but examining Human Soul in general by its own reports of its self, such as he there calls (b) *vulgaria, communia, naturalia*, he says, *Jam nunc (Anima) quod ad necessariorem sententiam tuam spectet, quantum & ad ipsum statum tuum tendit, affirmamus te manere post vitæ disjunctionem, & expectare diem Judicii, proq; meritis aut cruciatui destinari, aut refrigerio ; utriq; sempiterno.*

36. How at length can any bold perverter of Antiquity be so injurious to this careful Author, as to bring him in a Wit-

(a) *De Animâ, cap. 39.* (b) *De Test. Animæ, cap. 4. & 5.*

ness of the Soul's natural Mortality? Why, (says Mr. Dodwel, pag. 58.) he derives the Human Soul from the Flatus in Genesis, and he distinguishes this Flatus or πνοή from the Spiritus or πνεῦμα, as Irenæus, and others do. This he quotes from a Chapter in which, with no little mortification, he may observe, that Tertullian positively declares against his darling Distinction betwixt Soul and Spirit. But as for his *crambe* of πνοή and πνεῦμα, 'twas from the beginning so foreign to the whole Question, and is by this time become so stale in this Dispute, that I can scarce consent to allow it any farther Notice. Yet as I have observ'd under Irenæus, that he distinguish'd πνοή from πνεῦμα, no otherwise than as he distinguish'd the Soul of Man from the Holy Ghost: so to shew the Uniformity of Tradition, and the Harmony of the Fathers, on this Subject, I shall here add, that Tertullian is of the same mind; if a Passage that is not only an Imitation, but a Translation of Irenæus, may make him so. For whereas Irenæus speaking of the πνοή as a ποίησις, and the πνεῦμα as τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον, adds immediately, (α) ἕτερον ὃ ὄντι τὸ ποιῆθαι τὸ ποιήσαν]C: so Tertullian likewise, to the eternal

(α) Irenæus, lib. 5. cap. 12. Tertull. adv. Marc. cap. 9.

silencing of this pretended Argument, tells us, *Flasse Deum in faciem Hominis, & factum Hominem in Animam vivam, non in Spiritum vivificantem, separavit eam a conditione Factoris.* (a) *Opus enim aliud sit necesse est ab artifice.*

37. But Mr. *Dodwel's* main Ground for this Misrepresentation is still behind ; viz. *Tertullian* allow'd the Soul to be Corporeal ; a Property which must needs infer it to be Mortal ; and he is therefore to be cited as a Witness against himself, that he did not believe the Soul Immortal. Could we credit St. *Austin* rather than Mr. *Dodwel*, I would now cite that Father to the contrary ; and prove from him, that though *Tertullian* denied the Immateriality, he yet confess'd the Immortality of the Soul. *Tertullianus* (says he *Hæres.* 86.) *sicut scripta ejus indicant, Animam didicit Immortalem quidem, sed eam effigiatum Corpus esse contendit.* But what need we appeal to any other Compurgators, when no Equity, but that of Mr. *Dodwel*, would ever charge a Man with Opinions, against which he has enter'd his own solemn Protestation ? That *Tertullian* thus protests against any necessity of his concluding the Soul Mortal, because he would prove it to be Corporeal, may be seen in his 14th and 51th Chapters

Tertullian.

of

of the Book *de Anima*. 'Tis there that he renounces all thoughts of the Soul's being divisible and dissoluble, the two ordinary Qualities that dispose the Body to Mortality : and on this bottom he defies any one to charge him, with having advanc'd a Principle that endanger'd the Immortality of the Soul. *Quid nunc* (says he, chap. 9.) *quod & effigiem animæ damus, Platone nolente ? quasi periclitetur de animæ Immortalitate.* To think the Soul Corporeal, or that any thing Corporeal could be at the same time Immortal, was indeed the Error of *Tertullian*. But far from disparaging his Testimony concerning the Immortality of the Soul, this Error of his serves to strengthen and advantage it. Mr. *Dodwel's* Inference from thence is weak and injudicious : but the right one is on our side. *Viz.* If the Man who held the Soul to be Corporeal, did yet notwithstanding profess it to be Immortal, 'tis a sign that the Immortality of the Soul was a stable and sacred Truth ; a Truth agreeable to his own Conscience, and fenc'd by the current Tradition of those Times : otherwise he would have quitted it with great freedom, and never have espous'd a Principle that clash'd so apparently with some others he had establish'd.

Tertullian.

38. The

38. The next Author drawn most injuriously into this Controversy, is

St. Cyprian :

An Author which Mr. *Dodwel* finds entirely silent, as to the Terms of his Hypothesis, and never dropping the least shadow of Expression, that tends to represent the Soul otherwise than naturally Immortal. Yet he resolves to interest him in this Dispute, on account of some common and receiv'd Metaphors relating to our Christian Baptism. Now nothing is more universally understood, than those Figures by which our Baptism is represented as a new and spiritual Birth, in opposition to that first Birth of ours which is natural and carnal. Agreeably to this S. *Cyprian* in his Book *de Gratiâ Dei*, has these and the like Phrases, *In novum me Hominem nativitas secunda reparavit : — terrenum fuisse quod prius carnaliter natum Delictis obnoxium viveret ; Dei esse cepisse, quod quod jam Spiritus sanctus animaret.* These words are cited by Mr. *Dodwel*, as an Evidence of his Adscititious Immortalizing Baptismal Spirit. If so ; why were not the like Phrases of *Tertullian* urg'd ; who in his Book concerning Baptism, calls it in the same manner *novus natalis* ; nay who tells us that in *aquâ nascimur* ;

nascimur ; and adds, *ne mirum sit si in Baptismo aquæ animare noverunt* ? There is so little of extraordinary in these Expressions, either of S. Cyprian or his Master, that they fall much beneath the Phrase of *Optatus*, with whom Baptism has the stile of *Nativitas Immortalis*, and that of *Constantine* in *Eusebius*, who calls it *ἀθανάτου ἐκτελέσεως*. But all this is no more than the common Language of the Church, teaching us that at this second Birth we are adopted by the Holy Ghost to an Immortality of Happiness : not implying in the mean time, but that, at our first Birth, we were all equally entitled to an Immortality of Being. And that Mr. *Dodwel* may believe this, on the same Authority to which he has here appeal'd ; he may observe that S. Cyprian, speaking of those who are never born again by the Sacrament of Baptism, supposes 'em no less Immortal, than those which are. *Mori timeat*, (says he in his Treatise *de Mortalitate*) *qui ex Aquâ & Spiritu non renatus, Gehennæ Ignibus mancipatur : Mori timeat, quem, de seculo recedentem, perennibus pænis æterna flamma torquebit.* — What hinders now but that we make the due Advantage of St. Cyprian's Silence ; and consider it as more favourable in this Question, than if

it had been his exprefs Condemnation of Mr. *Dodwel* ? For if St. *Cyprian*, the Father, who pleaded every Vertue of Chriftian Baptifm, every Privilege of God's *Peculium*, was fo ignorant of this whole myfterious Hypothefis, if he fpeaks nothing of an Adfcititious Spirit immortalizing fome Souls to Happinefs, nothing of God's Pleafure immortalizing others to Damnation, and nothing of all the reft ever falling under actual Mortality ; then is it obvious to conclude, that thefe new Discoveries were as unknown to the firft, as they have fince been to our latter Ages. Otherwife, St. *Cyprian* undoubtedly was the Author, from whom we were to have receiv'd a full and zealous inculcation of each of thofe important Points.

39. Were the next Judge of this Difpute to have been named by any Perfon who had a veneration for Antiquity, equal to his knowledge of it, the Time and Character of the Man muft have directed him to *Methodius* : to *Methodius* Bifhop of Tyre, and Martyr : Author, among other things, of a Treatife concerning the Refurrection ; in which he fpeaks of the Soul's natural Immortality, as the receiv'd Doctrine of thofe Times, and labours at large to prove, that the whole Man like-

Cyprian.

wife

wife was at first created naturally Immortal. But instead of this we are carried by Mr. *Dodwel* to

Arnobius :

i. e. Not to a bare Novice in Christianity, but to one who, when he wrote his Treatise, was indeed no Christian : To one who was, at that time, not only not Baptiz'd, as all agree, but (if we may believe *S. Jerom* and *Baronius*) not (a) Admitted even a (b) *Catechumen* of the Church. But in order to obtain such an Admission, he presented to the Church, about the Year 300, a Piece, which he had then compos'd in Seven Books, *adversus Gentes*. And in truth that was no improper Title of a Work, which the Learned World has always look'd upon as an ingenious Declamation against Heathenism, but as having

(a) *Arnobius Rhetor clarus in Africâ habetur ; qui quum in civitate Sicca ad declamandum Juvenes erudiret, & adhuc Ethnicus ad credulitatem somniis compelleretur, neq; ab Episcopo impetraret fidem quam semper impugnaverat, elucubravît adversus pristinam Religionem luculentissimos libros, & tandem velut quibusdam obsidibus Pietatis Fœdus impetravit. Hieron. in Chronico Eusebii ad an. 2. Olymp. 276. (b) Quod nondum plene esset scientiâ rerum Christianarum imbutus, utpote cum non solum non fuerit Baptismate illustratus, sed nec in Ecclesiam inter Catechumenos receptus, veniâ dignus est, &c. Baron. ad An. 302. n. 67.*

a very small and very wrong taste of Christianity. Yet even thus low has Mr. *Dodwel* condescended, for the support of a very lame Hypothesis. 'Tis in this one single Author, that, without Torture and Misrepresentation, he at length finds a Testimony of some sort, that the Soul is a Principle naturally Mortal. I say of some sort, because it were indeed easy to invalidate that Testimony, by observing the great difference betwixt *Arnobius* and Mr. *Dodwel*, as to their accounting for the Mortality of some Souls, and the Immortality of others; and by proving that *Arnobius* advanc'd this Principle not against the Christian, but the (a) *Platonic* Immortality; running on in a Conceit, (b) that Immortality and Divinity was the same thing, and (c) that nothing could be susceptible of Pain and Punishment that was

(a) *Quid Plato vester (sa s he) in eo volumine quod de Animæ Immortalitate composuit? Lib. 3. pag. 67. Edit. Han.* And so he proceeds in the Passages cited by Mr. *Dodwel* to dispute against the particular Branches of the *Platonic* Hypothesis. (b) *Nunquam sibi adsciscerent divinam immortalitatemque naturam . . . nunquam crederent typho & arrogantia sublari divina esse se numina, &c. p. 72. and frequently elsewhere.* (c) *Quis Hominum non videt quod sit immortale, quod simplex, nullum posse dolorem admittere? p. 68.* And again, *Qui poterit territari formidinis alicujus horrore, cui fuerit persuasum, tam se esse Immortalem quam ipsum Deum primum? p. 81.*

Immortal. To this I might add our Author's gross Ignorance of the New, and more notoriously of the Old Testament; his Intimation that Christians knew nothing of the Creation of Man, or of the (a) Origin of the Soul; and what is beyond all these, a shame which Mr. *Dodwel* must, in some measure, partake with him. For as Mr. *Dodwel* urges these words from *Arnobius*, [*Res vestra in ancipiti sita est, salus dico Animarum vestrarum, & nisi vos applicatis Dei Principis notioni, a corporali-bus vinculis exolutos expectat Mors seva, &c.*] so *Arnobius*, wise and well-inform'd Christian as he was, urges these, and others of the same tenour, as the (b) words of Christ. Thus, I say, 'twere no uneasy matter to take likewise from Mr. *Dodwel*, even this Testimony of *Arnobius*: But I rather choose to leave it undisputed to him, in token of the greater Heterodoxy and Scandal of his Hypothesis. And to the same end, he may strengthen it, if he thinks fit, by this (c) Observation of *Du*

(a) *Quid ergo? Nos soli ignoramus? Nescimus quisnam sit Animarum conditor? Quisnam constitutor? Quae causa Hominem finxerit? Mala unde proruperint? Lib. 2. pag. 103.* (b) *Quid est (inquit) vobis investigare, conquirere, quisnam Hominem fecerit? Animarum origo quae sit? Quis malorum excogitaverit causas?* And so he runs on, 'till he comes to the words above-quoted, the *inquit* at the beginning, referring all along to Christ. *Lib. 2. p. 107.* (c) *Bibliothèque Eccl. Tom. prem. p. 204.*

Arnobius.

N

Pin.

Pin. Arnobe (says he) *croit que l'ame est corporelle, &c.* i. e. Arnobius believes that the Soul is Corporeal; that 'tis procreated by the Parents; that Man is little different from Beast; that the Soul is of its own nature Mortal, but that it becomes Immortal by the Grace of God: Thoughts that are unworthy, surely, of a Man instructed perfectly in Religion. But enough of this Author; whose Errors some Judicious Men have indeed endeavour'd to excuse, but none ever yet pleaded as Authorities, and as the Catholic Doctrines of that Age. Mr. Dodwel therefore would do well to satisfy the World, for what honest End, and upon what justifiable Grounds, he introduc'd *Arnobius* in this place instead of *Methodius*. Especially, since the latter suffer'd Martyrdom for the Church, near that very time, in which the former publish'd his loose Harangues, as a Candidate of Christianity.

40. But the Eloquent Scholar of *Arnobius* was so much a truer Christian, as he was a truer Orator than his Master. I cannot therefore but close very readily with Mr. Dodwel, in appealing to

Lactantius.

Though I must freely own, that I foresee no small difficulty how to report his Verdict.

dist. Should I here gravely inform the World, that *Lactantius* is another Witness in favour of the Soul's natural Immortality, 'twere an Affront to Learning, and to Learned Men. For with These, the very Name of *Lactantius* signifies an Author, who has wrote as Piously, as Learnedly, as Convincingly for the Immortality of the Soul, as Mr. *Dodwel* (in some Mens Opinion) may have done against it. But if *Lactantius* has so notoriously espous'd this Doctrine, that 'twere absurd to draw up any Information of it to Mankind; how great then must be the Absurdity of that Man, who would inform us that He has espous'd the contrary? Yet this has Mr. *Dodwel* done; and that not ludicrously, to give an Essay of his Wit, like him who turn'd *Homer* into Gospel, or *Virgil* into a nuptial Ballad; but he has done it very seriously, with all the marks of an earnest and desperate Intention; such as became Him who was Unchurching almost the whole Christian World. This perhaps may be surprizing to all those who judge of Mr. *Dodwel* from this single Instance: but to me, who have familiarly observ'd the Guise of the Man in this whole Controversy, there is nothing unexpected, nothing of wonder in all this. 'Twas not

only his injurious Treatment of so many Saints and Martyrs, that has often, though in vain, tempted me to digressions from my main Design : 'twas, beyond all this, a constant practice of begging the Question in dispute ; a resolution to honour every thing, that conspir'd with him, by the name of *Catholic* and *Divine* ; a magnifying the meanest Authors, where they seem to fall in with his intent ; a huge pother with the Fathers, where they are moving a Doubt in one Page, but an averfeness to report, and perhaps to read them, where they settle it in the next ; a playing with Words ; an arguing from Shadows, and mistaken Criticisms ; a silencing his own contrary Suggestions ; an habitual shyness of every thing that makes against him ; and, in short, the Spirit of Imposture in all its shapes.

41. Thus much I could not but observe, once for all, in so proper a place as this. But I must now consider in what light to set the Testimony of *Lactantius*. Shall I therefore make a large recital of those many solemn Passages, in which he asserts and proves the Divine Origin, and the endless Survival of the Soul, not by any new Indulgence of its Maker, but by Properties that were natural to it, when first

Lactantius.

in-

inspir'd into the Body? This were an endless, and, I may add certainly, a very needless work. For *Lactantius* is an obvious Author, in the hands of all Learned Men; not lying hid in M. S. nor secur'd in Mr. *Dodwel's* single custody; as, from the account he has given of him, one would suppose he was. Shall I then single out some more eminent Instances of his Opinion, and leave them to be consider'd as a Specimen of all the rest? This might indeed be a proper Method, with an Author who had only incidentally dropt his Thoughts, and not deliver'd them at large on this very Subject, as *Lactantius*, 'tis known, has done. Instead of this therefore I shall observe, that *Lactantius*, as to the whole Condition of the Soul, has indeed his Heterodoxies: but they are such as relate to its Origin, not to its Survival. He conceives it as a (a) Fiery Substance, but at the same time as a Particle or Efflux of the Divine Nature (b), deriv'd from that, as from a vital and ever-flowing

(a) *Institut. lib. 2. cap. 12.* (b) *Ibid. Fictō corpore inspiravit ei Animam de vitali fonte Spiritus sui, qui est perennis.* Words too much conformable to the *Platonists*, and other Sects, who look'd upon the Soul as a *τμήμα*, an *ὑποπόση*, or an *ὑπόποση* of the Divine Nature, and talk much of the *Fons Animarum*; the *ζωαρχὴ πνεύ*, and the *πνεῦμα αἰώνιον*, &c.

Fountain. Notions, which (c) Prudentius has included in that Address of his to God, when he says, *Deus, ignee fons Animarum*; and which these, as well as other mistaken Christians of that time, imbib'd unwarily from that Scheme of Philosophy they had studied most. But this very Error of Lactantius, concerning the Original of the Soul, could not but necessarily determine him to the Eternity of its Survival. He therefore inculcates that, as an irresistible Persuasion, in almost every part of his Works; but more particularly in that place to which he himself (d) often refers his Reader, viz. in the last Book of his *Institutions*, from the 8th to the 14th Chapter. There, among many Arguments, to prove the eternal indissoluble nature of the Soul, and among as many Answers to those who would suppose it dissoluble and temporary, these Expressions more particularly will deserve the notice of the Reader. (e) *Quod ex terra fuit, in terram resolvitur; quod ex Cælesti Spiritu, id constat ac viget semper; quoniam Divinus Spiritus sempiternus est.* — (e) *Anima, quæ fragilis non est, in æternum manet; quoniam*

(c) Catthem. Hym 10. (d) See Lib. 3. Chap. 13. & 17.
(e) Lib. 7. cap. 12.

origo ejus aeterna est. — To which may be added his peculiar Thoughts concerning the Souls of the Wicked ; even those which, by a signal Heterodoxy, he excludes from all concern in the Resurrection ; viz. that they are (f) *non extinguibiles in totum, quia ex Deo sunt.* Where, by the way, the Phrase of *non extinguibiles in totum*, cannot but be thought very parallel to that of *ἐκ θεοῦ γεννηται*, in Justin Martyr ; and will therefore confirm that (g) explication I insisted on, when clearing the Opinions of that Father. To say nothing how far Lactantius had before asserted the Soul's Eternity, in words that come up very clearly to the same Notion. *Mors (Animam) non funditus perimit ac delet, sed aeternis afficit cruciatibus. Nam interire prorsus Anima non potest ; quoniam ex Dei Spiritu, qui aeternus est, originem cepit. Lib. 7. c. 12.*

42. Yet these ample Declarations of our Author must be at once intirely revers'd, because Mr. Dodwel has discover'd some Sounds or Shadows of Expression, which, by a shameful partiality, he will needs register as Testimonies of the contrary. Thus when Lactantius enlarges on the natural

(f) Lib. 7. cap. 20. (g) See Sect. 12. of this Chapter, and observe the contrary account of the pious Soul, which according to the Oracle in Lact. . . . ἐς αἰῶνα, πᾶσι πορεύεται,

ἄνθρωπος ὅς ἐστι, ὡς αὐτὸς ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος. L. 7. c. 13

Lactantius.

N 4

Mor-

Mortality of *Man* ; Mr. *Dodwel* catches at that handle, and thinks he has found an Evidence of the Mortality of the *Soul*. When *Lactantius* all along discourses of the Immortality of *Happiness*, alleging that 'tis entail'd upon our Vertue, and not our Nature ; Mr. *Dodwel* understands this of the Immortality of *Being* ; and observes we are not naturally, but conditionally entitled to Immortality. But to shew that *Lactantius* did indeed guide himself by these Distinctions, and that they will at once effectually answer all that shew of words which Mr. *Dodwel* produces from this Author, it may be convenient to transcribe the following Summary of his Doctrine : and this the rather, because it occurs in that account he has given us of the Origin of Man, (*lib. 2. cap. 12.*) *Ex rebus diversis ac repugnantibus Homo factus est, sicut ipse mundus ex luce ac tenebris, ex vitâ & morte. Quæ duo inter se pugnare in Homine præcepit ; ut si Anima superaverit quæ ex Deo oritur, sit immortalis, & in perpetuâ luce versetur : si autem Corpus vicerit Animam, ditioniq; subjecerit ; sit in tenebris sempiternis, & in morte. Cujus non ea vis est, ut injustas animas extinguat omnino, sed ut puniat in æternum. Eam penam, secundam mortem nominamus ; quæ est & ipsa*

Lactantius.

perpetua,

perpetua, sicut & immortalitas. Primam sic definimus: Mors est naturæ animantium dissolutio. Vel ita: Mors est corporis animæque, seductio. Secundam vero sic: Mors est eterni doloris perpassio. Vel ita: Mors est animarum pro meritis ad æterna supplicia damnatio. These words, surely, will inform even the perversest understanding, how the Soul may lose an Immortality, and yet never die: or on the other side, how the Soul may be said to die, and yet never lose its Immortality.

43. But notwithstanding this and other repeated Testimonies, that the Soul of Man can never die; no, not even in that state which emphatically bears the name of Death; Mr. *Dodwel* has the hardiness to urge an Impropriety of Speech, once dropt by *Lactantius*; and from his saying (*lib. 7. cap. 11.*) that [*resurgunt animæ ad vitam perennem*], he will needs conclude that he allow'd a real Resurrection; and if a real Resurrection, then certainly an actual Death of Souls. But he might have consider'd, that it is not the dead Carcase that is to be the subject of the Resurrection, but the Carcase as again united to, and actuated by the Soul; and that upon this account the phrase of *rising* (*i. e.* of returning with the re-assum'd Body) has been applied to

Lactantius.

the

the Soul, not only by *Lactantius*, but by (a) *Irenæus*, and (b) *Justin Martyr*, and others, who dreamt nothing of the actual Death of Souls. Yet if it had not; what rational Person would ever have concurr'd with him, in reversing the clear establish'd Sentiments of an Author, for the meer form of one Expression, that seem'd to look another way?

44. The same Unreasonableness Had almost carried him a step farther, and from a gross misconception of these words, [*Animæ ad cœlestia genitæ*], had very near tempted him to believe, that Souls, those Candidates of Heaven, were thought by *Lactantius* to have been produc'd, by ordinary generation, of the Human Parents. But being drove from that Imagination by our Author's protesting against any such Opinion, when in his Book *de Opificio Dei*, he says, *Serendarum Animarum ratio uni ac soli Deo subjacet*; Mr. *Dodwel* yet continues the Objection, by help of his old Maxim; viz. *That to be Genitum overthrows all title to a natural Mortality: Whether it be* (says

(a) *Iren. lib. 5. cap. 31.* 'Αἱ ψυχὰς . . . ἀπαλαβῶσι τὰ σώματα, καὶ ὁλοκλήρως ἀναστῶσι, τούτῃσι σωματικῶς . . . ὥς εἰς ἐλπίσιν εἰς ὃν τῷ Θεῷ. (b) *Just. Mart. de Resur. Spicil. Sec. 2. Pag. 190.* Πῶς ἔν τῃς νεκρῶς ἀνέστη; ἀότιον τῶν ψυχῶν, ἢ τὰ σώματα; ἀλλὰ δῆλον, ὅτι ἀμφοτέρω.

he p. 75.) γεννηται (a) signifying a begotten, or κτισται signifying a created Being. This Maxim he once palm'd upon Irenæus, in that very place where Irenæus was disclaiming it : and in truth, he has now mentioned it altogether as unreasonably under Lactantius. For I am now about to produce a decisive Passage of Lactantius, in which (to the utter ruine of our Author's trite Suggestion) he tells us that several Philosophers, not knowing the true nature of Man, have err'd either as to the beginning, or the end of Human Soul : but that we Christians only have hit upon the truth, allowing it indeed a beginning, yet believing it to have no end. *Non putaverunt (says he) aliter fieri posse, ut supersint animæ post corpora ; nisi videantur fuisse ante corpora. Par igitur ac prope similis error est partis utriusq; . Sed hæc in præterito falsa est, illa in futuro. Nemo enim vidit quod est verissimum, & nasci animas, & non occidere : quia cur id fieret, aut que ratio esset Hominis, nescierunt. Inst. lib. 3. cap. 18.* The sense of the whole Christian World is thus clearly oppos'd to Mr. Dodwel

(a) This I have here quoted as Mr. Dodwel's Expression : but have taken a small liberty of altering the Orthography of the first Greek word, and the Translation of the second.

Lactantius.

by

by *Lactantius*. And to shew yet farther the uniformity of this Tradition, Mr. *Dodwel* may observe *Methodius* disputing against him in the like manner, nay against those very terms, into which he has now cast the Objection: viz. (b) πᾶν τὸ κτισμένον ἢ γεννημένον ἀπόλλυται. — Thus much for *Lactantius*: whom if any Person will still urge as a Witness of the Soul's natural Mortality, let such an one observe one more Sentence dropt likewise in his Favour by *Lactantius*; viz. *Discipulus hic fortasse Anaxagoræ fuerit, cui nives atramentum fuerunt. Lib. 5. c. 3.*

45. We are come at length to the last Judge of this Appeal; one whom Mr. *Dodwel* is pleas'd to honour with a particular mark of Deference, and to regard as the most confess'd standard of Orthodoxy from his own to these present Times. This therefore is

St. *Athanasius*;

A Father, to whom I allow that, and indeed a much greater Character: desiring it may be pleaded in its full weight, to the Condemnation of all those who shall dare to misrepresent him. Now in order to re-

(b) i. e. Every thing created or begotten must have an end. See *Method. apud Epiphan. Hæres. 64. pag. 533.*

port the Verdict of St. *Athanasius* in our present Question, Mr. *Dodwel* remits us to two (a) Treatises concerning the Incarnation, the one wrote against the Heathens of that time, the other against *Apollinaris*. But in either of these there is not so much as one word pretended to be advanc'd concerning the Condition of the Soul ; nothing but what relates to the Condition of the First Man, to the Mortality which overtook him and his Posterity upon his Fall, and to the repair of this Mortality by the Incarnation of our Saviour. All this therefore is so palpably foreign to the Debate ; that it may justly be dismiss'd without farther Consideration : and the Proof of our Author's Sentiments refer'd to that Episode of his, wherein he treats expressly of the Condition of the Soul. But that I may afterwards come to that, with the greater Advantage ; I shall here consent to go out of the way with Mr. *Dodwel* ; and shall shew that even this foreign piece, concerning the Mortality of Man, will indeed overthrow, but not in the least support his Hypothesis concerning the Mortality of the Soul.

(a) See the first of these *Tom. 1. Pag. 47. Edit. Par. 1698.*
and the second *Tom. 1. Pag. 922.*

46. For in the first place, whereas he would here introduce *Athanasius* owning Mankind *in ingens æt. & i. idia; ymicos (ad)on dia* *ulcan aet*, i. e. not able to continue for ever, by vertue of their own proper constitution; This Suggestion is a gross Fallacy; and upon a bare consulting of the Passage, those words will be found to prove the direct contrary. For they are not to be understood of Man as already created, but of the unfinish'd Idea of Man, as yet lying in the mind of his Creator. They speak of God, as foreseeing that to make Man a perpetual Being, something farther must be given to him than to other Animals: Whereupon God chose not only to create him, but to create him after his own Image, i. e. to endue him with a Principle of Reason, and (a) by vertue of that Principle, with a title to Perpetuity. This is the true scope of that Passage; and accordingly, S. *Athanasius* sums up his sense thereon in this express conclusion, *ἦτοις ὅτι θεὸς ὁ ἀνθρώπου πεποίηκε, καὶ ὡς αὐτὸν ἔδειξεν ἐν ἀσθαρσίᾳ*, i. e. God therefore thus made Man incorruptible, and was willing he should continue such. In the next place, whereas Mr. *Dodwel*

(a) Tom. I. Pag. 49. which compare with the Fragment of *Just. Martyr* preserv'd by *Leontius*.

would infer from several Passages of these Treatises, that the Sentence by which Man forfeited this Immortality, was a Sentence of actual Death, or extinction to his Soul; I answer, that it was only a Sentence of Dissolution to the whole Man; and such as supposes a continuance, not an extinction of the Soul. This, if he may explain himself, is the express Doctrine of S. Athanasius: For he says, *That whereas Men were grown devoid of a sense of God, 'twas but reasonable that they should likewise be devoid of being, what otherwise they should always be.* (a) Ἦν τε δὲ οὕτως, says he, τὸ διαλυθῆναι αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ καὶ τῇ φθορᾷ. i. e. And this consisted in their continuing dissolv'd under a state of Death and Corruption. But speaking elsewhere more particularly of this Dissolution, he does it, I think, in such terms, as may silence all pretences of proving, from any Doctrine of his, this natural Mortality of the Soul. (b) Νεκρωθεὶς ἀνθρώπου ἀμορφῶς λήγει, καὶ λυγίσαι ἄλλῃ· τῆς ψυχῆς, ἣ ἄλυσον ἔχουσα τὴν φύσιν, ἀποκαταστάσεως ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος. i. e. The deceas'd Man is reckon'd to be without form, and is totally dissolv'd: his Soul, which has a Nature that is indissoluble, being departed from the Body.

(a) Tom. I. Pag. 51. (b) Tom. I. Pag. 940.

47. But he insists upon *Athanasius's* Exposition of that Divine Threat *θανάτω θανάτω*; and this more particularly, as by *Athanasius* in the (a) Treatise against *Apollinaris*, this Threat is restrain'd to the Soul alone, (b) *Thou shalt die the death*, contradistinct to what is threatened to the Body, *Dust Thou art, and to Dust Thou shalt return*. Now the Exposition given by *Athanasius*, of this Divine Threat, is this, viz. (c) that it implies, *μὴ μόνον ἀποθνήσκειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ θανάτῳ φθορᾷ μένει*, i. e. *not only to die, but to continue under the corruption of Death*. Words, which Mr. *Dodwel* is so unhappy as to understand of an Extinction; whereas they palpably imply not an Extinction, but a Duration in Being. And if occasion were, this may be unanswerably illustrated from a parallel Passage of *Philo*, which 'tis more than probable *Athanasius* had now in view. (d) Speaking of a double Death, one of the Man, and the other of the Soul; *concerning the latter we must observe* (says he) *that God threatned, ἐκ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτὸ μόνον ἀλλὰ θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖν, δηλοῦν ἔστι καὶ κοινὸν ἀλλὰ καὶ αἰδιον καὶ κατ' ἕξοχον θάνατον*. i. e. *He threatned not only that the Soul should die, but die the Death; implying, not*

(a) *Tom. 1. Pag. 934.* (b) *Θανάτῳ ἀποθανῶ.* (c) *Tom. 1. Pag. 50.* (d) *Philo de leg. Alleg. lib. 1. pag. 60.*

a common, but an extraordinary and eternal Death. He continues therefore, ὅτι δ' ἂν ὅν λέγει θανάτῳ ὑποθανεῖν, ὁ θάνατος, ὅτι θάνατον ἢ ὅτι πῶς λαμβάνει ἢ φύσιν γινώσκον. i. e. When he speaks therefore of dying the Death, observe, that he understands the Death of Punishment, and not of Nature. And a Phrase of his in another Work, is a clear Comment on what *Athanasius* understands by μένει ἐν θανάτῳ, viz. (a) ζῆν ὑποθήσασθαι αἰεὶ, καὶ τρόπον τινὰ θάνατον ὑπομένειν καὶ ἀπελθίσσον, i. e. to live always a dying, and to sustain as it were a Death, and that an endless one. But I am sensible I lose too many words in refuting the Suggestions dropt by Mr. *Dodwel* under this Author; which if they import any thing, it must be the Extinction of the Soul together with the Body; a Position which Mr. *Dodwel* indeed has disavow'd, but argues in too many places as if he had never done so. In short therefore, a bare inspection into these Treatises of *Athanasius*, will convince the Reader, that he there advances only these three Points; viz. 1. That Man forfeited the Immortality in which he was first created. 2. That this Forfeiture of an Immortality consisted in the consignment of his Body to the πῦρ,

(a) Philo de premiis & penis. Pag. 921.

i. e. the Sepulchre, and his Soul to *ἀδης*,
i. e. the receptacle of separate Spirits. But
3. That his Soul and Body were to be de-
liver'd from each of these unnatural states,
by (a) Christ's introducing a Resurrection;
that is, such a Dispensation of Divine
Grace, as might restore the Soul of Man to
his Body, and his Body from the Grave.

48. But 'tis a shrew'd evidence of Im-
posture, when any Controvertist shall thus
court the imperfect Suffrages of an Author
in Passages that are plainly foreign to the
Subject, but shall be shy of what he says
in others, that were wrote on purpose for
the Resolution of this very Question. Now
St. *Athanasius*, who is here treating of the
Condition of the whole Man, has in ano-
ther branch of this very Work, inserted
an exprefs Epifode concerning the Condi-
tion of the Soul. In this, one whole Pa-
ragraph is employ'd to decide the Question
of its Immortality; nay rather, it begins
with it, as a Point beyond all Question,
and such as Ecclesiastical Tradition had
now left no Man the liberty of debating.

(b) "Ὅτι ὁ ἀθάνατος μένει ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἀναγκαῖον
εἶναι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησιαστικῇ διδασκαλίᾳ. i. e. *In the*

(a) Τῇ τῇ ἀναστάσεως χάριτι ὁ θάνατος ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀς κα-
λῶς πρὸς ἑξαφανίζον. *Tom. 1 p. 54.* Which compare
with what he says p. 934. & 954. (b) *Tom. 1. p. 31.*

Athanasius,

Doctrine

Doctrine of the Church, 'tis likewise necessary to know that the Soul's Immortal. Who would now imagine that Mr. Dodwel had quoted this very Sentence, and yet past it by without remorse, or without the least abating of his pretences to the Testimony of St. *Athanasius*? Yet this he has gravely done: at once silencing his own Thoughts, and all that can be said by *Athanasius*, with his old forc'd distinction betwixt a natural and actual Immortality; and pretending, that notwithstanding those express words, 'twas neither the Doctrine of the Church, nor of St. *Athanasius*, that the Soul is Immortal of its own Nature. Now one would think that this was fully enough implied, in the whole tenour of the Discourse; which being directed against the Heathens of that time, proceeds upon no other than natural Arguments. Nay, nothing less could be implied in the bare Phrase of ἀθάνατος γένεσις, where γένεσις plainly denotes an Immortality, by Vertue of the Soul's Birth or Creation; either of which is as much as a natural Immortality. But 'tis not for want of express Evidences, that I fly to such as are implied. For, I shall condescend to all the unreasonable Conditions he imposes in this Dispute, and shall observe to him out of

Athanasius.

O 2

Atha-

Athanasius, the terms of his own choosing. To this end, let us once for all repeat the Question in Debate, *viz.* *Whether the Soul was created an Immortal Substance, and of such a nature as needed not any new Indulgence of its Creator, that it might live for ever*; and then let it be consider'd, whether we could have desired to close this whole Appeal, with an Author more decisive in our favour, than *St. Athanasius*. For to say nothing of this being at once intirely evidenc'd by words I have before observ'd, where the Soul is kil'd by *Athanasius*, ἀλυτον ἔχουσα τὴν φύσιν, i. e. *having a Nature that is indissoluble*; what can be more plain than the comparison he here makes betwixt the Soul and Body; demonstrating that the Soul is in all respects different from the Body, and concluding, that the Body being *naturally* Immortal, the Soul must be so too? Yet this follows those very words which *Mr. Dodwel* will needs understand of an actual, not a natural Immortality. (a) Ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἄλλω αὐτῷ ὁ λόγος ἀπιδείξει ὅτι τὸ σῶμα, ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα ΘΥΣΕΙ ὀνητόν, ἀνάγκη τὴν ψυχὴν ἀθάνατον εἶναι, καὶ μὴ εἶναι καὶ τὸ σῶμα. i. e. *If my Discourse has prov'd the Soul to be quite different from the Body, and the Body be NATURALLY Mortal,*

(a) Pag. 31.

Athanasius.

then

then is the Soul, of necessity, Immortal; by reason it must be quite otherwise than the Body is. But he continues to describe the manner of the Soul's survival, in terms which unanswerably demonstrate that he conceiv'd the security of its Immortality to be from its own frame, not from any new Indulgence, or extrinsecal Support.

(a) 'Αἱ περὶ τῆς Ἀθανασίας ἐννοιαί καὶ θεωρίαι ὑδέποτε ἀντὶ τῶ ἀφαιῶσι ῥέεσθαι ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ ὥσπερ ἔκταυμα ἐν αὐτῇ γινόμεναι ποτὶς ἀσφαλῆσαι τῆς Ἀθανασίας. i. e. *The Notions and Contemplations of Immortality do never desert the Soul, but remain there, and are in it, as it were a living spark, for the security of its Immortality.* And lastly, that we may no longer transcribe repeated Testimonies of the same thing, let this one Sentence be observ'd as a short but pithy sum of what *Athanasius*, and all the preceding Fathers, have believ'd concerning the survival of the Soul. (a) ἡ παύσις τῆς ζῆν, διὰ τὴν αὐτῶς αὐτῷ ποιήσαντα Θεόν. i. e. *The Soul shall never cease to live, by reason of God's having created it in that manner.* This therefore is the Testimony which I have chosen for the close of this whole Appeal; and that, I hope, neither improperly, nor unfortunately; since it comes

(a) Tom. 1, Pag. 32.

Athanasius.

up in exprefs terms to that Proposition which Mr. *Dodwel* denied capable of being

* See *Epist. Disc.* prov'd from the first Fathers, p. 33. viz. * *That the Soul's conti-*

nued survival is for ever, without a new Indulgence of God, above what he granted it at its Creation.

49. It now only remains that I add one word, as a farther Vindication of St. *Athanasius*, whom Mr. *Dodwel*, by a shameful Forgery, is pleased to make an espouser of his distinction between Soul and Spirit. As a true Argument of *his respect to this blessed Father*, he pretends that he has concurr'd exactly with his Doctrine of the $\psi\chi\eta$

* See *Epist. Disc.* and $\piνεῦμα$: * Nay farther, p. 86. that he has oppos'd the $\psi\chi\eta$

$\sigma\alpha\rho\iota\kappa\eta$ to the $\psi\chi\eta$ $\piνευματικ\eta$, and suppos'd the former capable of being kill'd as the Body is, unless it be secur'd by the latter, as by an adscititious Principle of Immortality. Thus the Zeal of Mr. *Dodwel* can fix any Indignity upon the Fathers, tho' through the blindness of the same Zeal it turns generally upon his own Head. And of this he has here furnish'd us with one very signal Instance. For to prove all this pretended concurrence of *Athanasius*, he produces a very plain Passage, in which *Athanasius* absolutely disclaims that distin-

Athanasius.

ction

tion betwixt the $\Psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ and $\pi\pi\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$: nor this only, but explodes the term of $\Psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ σαρκική, as a groundless invention of the *Apollinarian* Heretics, contrary to the tenour of Holy Scripture, and the common Reason of Mankind. $\Psi\upsilon\chi\eta\eta$ σαρκικήν γράφατε (says he) πόθεν μαθόντες ἐ συνεπίσταμαι· ἔτε γδ ἐκ τοῦ ἁγίου γραφῶν ὅτιν εὐρεῖν οὐκ ἔστι, ἔτε ἐν τῷ κοιτῶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου λογισμῷ, τοῦ κυρίου λέγοντος, μὴ φοβηθῆτε ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος τὸ σῶμα, τὸ δὲ $\Psi\upsilon\chi\eta\eta$ μὴ δυναμένων ἀποκτείνειν. Καὶ πῶς εἰ σαρκική ἡ $\Psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ καὶ ὑμεῖς, ἐ συνθήσεται τὸ σῶμα καὶ συμφθίσει; Πῶς δὲ καὶ ὁ Πέτρος τὰς ἐν αἵνῳ κληρομένους $\Psi\upsilon\chi\alpha\varsigma$ πνεύματα ὀνομάσας ἔλεγεν, Ἐπορεύθη τις ἐν φυλακῇ κατακακλεισμένοις πνεύμασιν, ἐυαγγελισάς τινα ἀνάστασιν; ἀλλὰ ὑμεῖς πάντα τοῦτο οὐκ ἔχετε καὶ ὀνομάζετε. *Lib. 2. contra Apoll. p. 946. i. c.*

In your Writings you have introduc'd the notion of $\Psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ σαρκική, or a fleshly Soul; thot from whence you have learn'd this, I am wholly ignorant. For this is neither to be found in the Holy Scriptures, nor in the common Reason of Mankind: It being the Expression of our Saviour, Fear not those who kill the Body, but cannot kill the Soul. And if according to you, the Soul indeed be fleshly, how comes it to pass, that it does not die and perish together with the Body? Or how comes it to pass, that Peter giving the Souls in Hades the name of Spirits, says, that he went and preach'd the

Resurrection to the Spirits in Prison ? But 'tis your practice to confound every thing by contrary Names and Notions.

50. Let others judge whether the close of this Quotation, is not a just Rebuke to Mr. *Dodwel*, who has not only adopted into his Hypothesis, this Heretical Notion of the $\psi\chi\eta$ $\sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\iota\kappa\eta$, but urg'd it most preposterously, from the Authority of a Passage that was wrote against it. Nay, he grossly here pretends that *Athanasius* employ'd the Distinction between Soul and Spirit, in opposition to the Heresy of *Apollinaris*; whereas *Athanasius* was the first, among many others, who now quitted that Distinction, because employ'd by the *Apollinarians* against the Church. 'Twas the *Apollinarians* peculiar Blasphemy, to assert that our Saviour did not take on him an Human Soul; at least, that if he took the $\psi\chi\eta$, yet he did not take the $\piνεϋμα$, i. e. he did not take the Rational, though he took the Sensitive and Fleshly Soul. In opposition to all this, S. *Athanasius* largely pleads, that their Notion of a Fleshly Soul is a groundless Fiction; nay, that there is no real Distinction betwixt the $\psi\chi\eta$ and $\piνεϋμα$, and consequently, that our Saviour who took on him the $\psi\chi\eta$, must necessarily have taken the $\piνεϋμα$ at the same time.

Athanasius.

This

This was the plain intent, nay, this is the plain expression of the Passage I have now recited. And instead of repeating others, which occur throughout that whole Treatise against *Apollinaris*, let this which follows be another Evidence of what I say.

(a) Ψυχὴν πνεῦμα ἔσαν σαφῶς αἱ. ἁγίας γενοὶ διδάσκεισι. καὶ ὁ κύριος ὁ εἰρηκὼς τὸ μὲν σῶμα ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων ἀποκτενόμενον, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν καὶ δυναμένων ἀποκτείνειν, ὅτι πνεῦμα ἔσαν. i. e. *That the Soul is the Spirit, the Scriptures do plainly teach us; and so does our Lord himself, saying, that the Body can be kill'd by Men, who yet are not able to kill the Soul: forasmuch as the Soul is Spirit.* Thus the Distinction of Soul and Spirit being once made the Bulwark of so foul an Heresy, 'twas immediately attack'd and ruin'd by this faithful Champion of the Church. And how universally he was afterwards seconded by all the Managers of that Controversy, may be observ'd, against the Falsifications of Mr. *Dodwel*, from these words of a very Learned Man, in his Annotations upon *Nemesius*. (b) *Postquam Apollinarii & ejus sequacium Dimoeritarum increbuit dogma,*

(a) Tom. i. pag. 952. See likewise pag 235, 242. and 238. Ψυχὴ ἀνθρώπου λέγεται καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἔπεσον πρὸς ἑπτερον ὅν, τετέστι πνεῦμα πρὸς σῶμα. (b) Annot. in Nem. Ed. Ox.

qui Dominum nostrum ex tribus partibus constitutum asserebant, ἐκ σαρκὸς, καὶ ψυχῆς, καὶ δυνάμεως ἁπλῆς τοῦ θεοῦ, (Epiphanii sunt verba pag. 1016.) quo certius eos profligarent Orthodoxi, deinceps receptæ prius sententiæ de tribus Animæ partibus valedixerunt, licet Apostoli verbis, 1 Thess. 5. 23. Firmamentum sibi arrogare videatur : & demum Hæreseos cujusdam apud Posteror arcessebatur, Animam a Spiritu secernere. This is indeed the truer account, which was now the Heretical, and which the Orthodox Opinion. But Mr. *Dodwel*, who had before given us some *Valentinian* Dreams as the Sentiments of *Ireneus*, has here, by the same Craft, furnish'd us with the unhallow'd Notions of the *Apollinarians*, for those of *Athanasius*. Blunders, that are no less unworthy of an Historian, than of a Divine ; and which may perhaps persuade some Men, that Mr. *Dodwel* must resign more than the pretence of Orthodoxy in this Dispute.

51. Thus fell the Distinction between Soul and Spirit, on that very occasion for which 'tis pretended by Mr. *Dodwel*, to have been most in vogue. 'Twas quasht as soon as it became the handle and the tool of Heresy ; though for that, and for no other purpose, 'tis now reviv'd again by *Socinus* and Mr. *Dodwel*. With this there-

therefore, which is his disguis'd Subject, I here shut up our Appeal concerning his real one, the Mortality of the Soul. For the Spirit of *Vincentius Lirinensis* is perhaps now coming upon the Reader; who bating the bitterness of that Thought, *about burning for ever with the Devil*, will yet stand up for the honour of so many Christian Fathers, and consent to the (a) remainder of that Sentence, first read against Mr. *Dodwel*, in the Introduction to this Discourse. But because this may be thought a partial manner of prejudging in my own favour, I submit the whole issue of our Appeal to be determin'd, not by any assum'd Verdict of *Vincentius*, but by this admirable Rule of his, which no Orthodox Christian can decline. *Cum primum malicujusq; erroris putredo erumpere ceperit, & ad defensionem sui quædam sacræ legis verba furari, atq; fallaciter & fraudulenter exponere: statim interpretandæ Canoni majorum sententiæ congregandæ sunt, quibus illud quodcunq; exurgat novitium, ideoq; prophanum, & absq; ambage prodatur, & sine ullâ retractione damnetur. Sed eorum duntaxat Patrum sententiæ conferendæ sunt, qui in*

(a) Qui cum sub alieno nomine Hæresin concinnare machinentur, &c. See *Introd. Sect. 18.* and *Vinc. cap. 11.*

*fide & communione Catholicâ sanctè sapien-
ter constanter viventes, docentes & perma-
nentes, vel mori in Christo fideliter, vel oc-
cîdi pro Christo feliciter meruerunt. Quibus
tamen hâc lege credendum est, ut quicquid
vel omnes, vel plures, uno eodemq; sensu,
manifeste, frequenter, perseveranter, velut
quodam consentiente sibi magistrorum conci-
lio, accipiendo, tenendo, tradendo firmave-
rint, id pro indubitato, certo, ratoq; habe-
tur. Quicquid vero, quamvis ille sanctus,
& doctus, quamvis Episcopus, quamvis Con-
fessor & Martyr, præter omnes, aut etiam
contra omnes senserit, id inter proprias &
occultas & privatas opiniunculas, a commu-
nis, publicæ, ac generalis sententiæ aucto-
ritate secretum sit : ne cum summo æternæ
salutis periculo, juxta sacrilegam Hæretico-
rum & Schismaticorum consuetudinem, uni-
versalis dogmatis antiquâ veritate dimissâ,
unius Hominis novitium sectemur errorem.*
Vinc. Lirin. cap. 39. — If this Rule may
take place, Mr. Dodwel's fortunate con-
currence with *Tatian the Heretic* in the de-
sign of his Hypothesis, and with *Arnobius
the Heathen* in the expression of his prin-
cipal Proposition, will weigh very little
towards an Atonement for his traducing
so many Blessed Martyrs and Doctors of
the Church. For in truth, those scandalous

Au.

Authorities condemn him no less by their consent, than these venerable ones by their dissenting from his Hypothesis. Every Judge in this Appeal, whose Suffrage could add any Strength or Honour to an Opinion, after having been sifted, strain'd and tortur'd, declares more or less, as the Subject or Occasion leads him, for the natural Immortality of the Soul. 'Tis not therefore the bare Heresy of affirming the Soul naturally Mortal, but the guilt of Forgery, Imposture, and Prevarication, that Mr. *Dodwel* has incur'd. And this Guilt, tho' in it self hainous and extravagant enough, is yet farther to be aggravated by one very material Observation: *viz.* Whereas 'tis in their Treatises of the Resurrection, that the Fathers ordinarily assert the Immortality of the Soul, and supposing the latter to be natural, from thence prove the former to be universal to Mankind; Mr. *Dodwel* on the contrary, is pleas'd to reverse both the one, and the other Article: And (to shew the contagion of the wrong, as well as the connexion of the right Faith) he ushers in his Heresy so destructive of the Immortality of the Soul, with another that is full as derogatory to the Resurrection of the Body.

III. 52. The Third Part of this Chapter is not of less weight, tho' it be of little labour ; and tho' it contains only an Observation, concerning some other Authors, who either were co-temporary to, or immediate successors of those cited by Mr. *Dodwel*. For it may here justly be demanded ; for what Reason we are thus confin'd to the Authorities of the foregoing List. They witness indeed very amply, and very harmoniously, a constant as well as early Tradition of the Soul's natural Immortality : But why may not the concurrent Suffrage of many others be admitted at the same time ? If Mr. *Dodwel* restrains his Appeal to the Authority of the three first Centuries, why was not *Methodius* heard, tho' he died for the confirmation of the Faith ? Why not *Origen*, tho' he was esteem'd at that time a Standard of Orthodoxy, as well as a Prodigy of Learning ; and was chosen by the whole Church, to silence the *Arabian* Heresy concerning the Mortality of the Soul ? But if we are carried beyond those bounds, to the time of *Athanasius's* Controversy with the *Apollinarians*, i. e. within Thirty Years of the Fifth Century, for what warrantable Reason is *Eusebius* slighted ? Upon what Grounds must we decline the Verdict
of

of *St. Basil*, of the two *Gregory's*, of *Ephranius*, together with the great Triumvirate of the following Age, *St. Chrysostom*, *St. Jerom*, and *St. Augustine* ? If others have been faithful Witnesses of the first Dawnings of the Gospel, these were the Great Luminaries which rul'd it in its Meridian Light. These, for their peculiar Character of Eloquence and Learning, were the Support of the then Christian World. These had now within their Custody, and under their continual Perusal, the Pious Treatises of all those who had so lately preceded them in the Church. These are they who wrote at that time, when the Nature of the Soul began to be accurately debated, for the more effectual Refutation of the *Apollinarian* Heresy. And yet these are they who call the Soul Immortal, as familiarly as they call it Rational ; and as occasion serves, signify that they understand this of the natural Condition of the Soul, not of the Soul as receiving any new adscititious Principle, in consequence of a Covenant of Grace. For a Specimen of all this, and for a Summary of the Catholic Doctrine on this Head, I shall produce the following Testimony ; being such as is deliver'd, not in one single Name, but in the Name of the whole Christian World ;
and

and such as comes up very faithfully to those terms, in which the Immortality of the Soul has been constantly and successively maintain'd, from the time of its first Infancy through all the riper Ages of the Gospel. (a) Ἡμῶν δὲ ἀρκαὶ πρὸς ἀπόδειξιν τῆς Ἀθανασίας αὐτῆς ἢ τῆς θείων λογίων διδασκαλίας τὸ πᾶν ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς ἔχουσα διὰ τὸ διόπνυσον εἶναι. Πρὸς δὲ τὰς μὴ καταδεχόμενες τὰς τῆς Χριστιανῶν γράμματα, ἀρκαὶ τὸ μηδὲν εἶναι τινὶ ψυχὴν τῆς φθαρτῶν ἀποδείξαι. Ἐν γὰρ μηδὲν ἔστι τῆς φθαρτῶν, ἔστι δὲ ἀφθαρτὴ, ἔστι καὶ ἀθάνατος.

i. e. *In order to demonstrate the Immortality of the Soul, to us the doctrine of the Divine Oracles is sufficient, which brings its Credentials with it self, in as much as it is inspir'd from God. But in regard to those who accept not the Scriptures of the Christians, 'tis enough if we demonstrate that the Soul is none of those things that are liable to Corruption. For if it is none of those, but is indeed Incorruptible, then is it Immortal too*

53. Such commonly is the Tenour of those Antient Authorities, which, for Reasons he best knows, Mr. Dodwel has carefully conceal'd. There are others of a far different sort, of which he had too great

(a) See this in *Nem. de nat. Hum.* p. 92. And among the Works of Greg. Nyssen *Tom. 1. pag 54.*

and too apparent reason to be silent. These have bore much the same Character in primitive, as *Socinus* in modern Theology : and together with him, have been one secret guide to the whole Thread of this formidable Hypothesis. The fuller Proof of this will be one Subject of my *Conclusion* ; but a Sketch of it will be a proper Appendix to this Chapter : that so I may charge Mr. *Dodwel* with that Antiquity which is scandalous, in a place where I have endeavour'd to deprive him of that which is truly venerable. Here therefore I would demand, upon what account he ambitiously turns every Stone, catches at every Shadow, pleads Words, Figures, and imperfect Sentences, with intent of forcing the good Fathers to subscribe to his Hypothesis ; whereas the several pestilent Heretics, against whom they expressly wrote, will plentifully answer his Design. For what reason is St. *Justin* misrepresented, St. *Irenæus* falsified, St. *Cyprian* tortur'd, and St. *Athanasius* palpably belied ; when without fraud or force, he has the full indisputable Concurrence of *Menander*, of *Valentinus*, of *Marcion*, of *Montanus* ? Is not the great Engine which he has here play'd against the Church, a Division of all Mankind into *Psychical* and *Pneumatical* ?

P

Does

Does not he abuse the former of these words, which with *St. Paul* and *St. Jude*, signifies only Men of sensual and deprav'd Affections, to the denoting all out of his Communion, as Persons that are meerly *animal*, endued only with an inferiour Soul? Does not he restrain the latter Appellation, to himself and each of his own Partisans, employing it to signify a higher degree of a perfect and superiour Nature; whereas the Church has always understood it of nothing else, but Men of reform'd Wills, and spiritualiz'd Desires? Is not this the powerful Charm that has been chanted to us in every Page of *Mr. Dodwel's* Book? And was it not the same Cant, in which almost all the *Gnostic* Heretics so scornfully attack'd the Church? Does not *Irenæus* give us a large account of these *ψυχικοί*, in the *Valentinian* Schemes; and then add, (a) εἶναι ὃ τέτυκτο ἀπὸ τῆ ἐκκλησίας ἡμῶν λέγεσθαι: i. e. *That 'tis we of the Church whom they reproach with this name of Psychical?* Was it not the *Montanist* presumption; and of *Tertullian*, as soon as apostatiz'd into that Tribe, to say, (b) *Nos postea agnitio Paracleti atq; defensio disjunxit a Psychicis?*

(a) *Iren. lib. 1. cap. 1. pag. 29. Ed. Ox.* (b) *Tertull. adv. Prax. cap. 1.* See him likewise *de Monogam.* c. 1.

Such is the general concurrence of this, and of those early Heresies. A Truth, of which Mr. *Dodwel* is so conscious, that in his 23d and 45th Paragraphs, he can scarce forbear pleading them as Authorities : and on that very head, which would have thrown any other Man into a fit of Remorse and Mortification, to see himself so far sunk in the very dregs of Heresy, he rather chooses to glory in his Shame, and gravely acquits himself by this most pleasant Observation : *So strange an agreement there is* (says he pag. 242.) *among all the Primitive Christians, Heretics as well as Catholics, in this matter.* But I must here beg his leave to add a Comment to this Sentence, and to observe that this strange Agreement is not betwixt the Heretics and Catholics of that Age, but betwixt what the Heretics have really said, and he, by a continued Forgery, would have palm'd upon the Catholics. How little the Catholics have favour'd, nay, how flatly they have contradicted his Design, will appear from any impartial Verdict upon the foregoing Appeal. The Agreement therefore is very full, and very punctual, betwixt him and those early Heretics. But that the Catholics have wrote with Zeal and Indignation against *his* and *their* fulsom Cant,

will appear from these following particulars ; which, perhaps, with some small regret, he will hereafter see detected in a more ample manner.

54. For *First* of all, Is it not the groundwork of this mighty Building, to suppose his *Pneumatical* Race partakers of a Divine Seed, and that this Seed is deriv'd to them by the Church here below, acting in conjunction with the Archetypal Church above ? Is not this *Σπρωματὶς Ἐπιστολικὸς*, as well as his *Parænesis*, pregnant of these weighty Thoughts ? And are not those the very Terms, for which *Tertullian* and *Irenæus*, have justly chastiz'd the *Valentinians* ? There we not only hear of a (a) *Peculium quoddam seminis spiritalis*, but as *Tertullian* adds, *Hoc semen Ecclesiam dicunt, Ecclesie supernæ speculum* : or as *Irenæus*, (b) *Ὁ δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ Ἐκκλησίας εἶναι λέγουσιν, ἀντίτυπον τῇ ἀνω Ἐκκλησίας.* i. e. *This Seed they pretend, to be the Church, the Antitype of the Church above.* In the next place, does not Mr. *Dodwel* maintain, that this Divine Seed is a certain Baptismal Spirit, and that this Baptismal Spirit, being administred in his, i. e. in a regular Communion, is an adventitious Na-

(a) *Tertull. adv. Valent. cap. 25.* (b) *Iren. lib. 1. cap. 1*
pag. 28.

ture to each baptized Person, by which, and which alone, his Body shall be entitled to a Resurrection, and his Soul to a blessed Immortality ? Is not this the clear strain of his whole Hypothesis ? And is it not that very boast, which *Tertullian* has so pleasantly ridicul'd and rallied in *Menander* ? In *Menander*, I say, whose extravagant pretence it was, (a) *in hoc scilicet se a supernâ & arcanâ potestate legatum, ut immortales, & incorruptibiles, & statim resurrectionis compotes fiant, qui ejus Baptisma induerint.* And lastly, least Mr. *Dodwel* should be thought to have advanc'd any thing without a warrant from Antiquity; by how just a parallel, does his singling out some particular Souls for Immortality, and leaving all the rest to Annihilation, agree with this following account of *Marcion's* presumptuous Doctrine ? For *Marcion* has taught, says *S. Irenæus*, (b) *Salutem solum Animarum esse futuram earum quæ ejus doctrinam didicissent.* Nay, not *didicissent*, but *audissent*, is the word which hitherto all Editions have acknowledg'd, And so the pretence of *Marcion* will appear exactly the same that Mr. *Dodwel's* does : namely, (c) that they who hear and

(a) *Tertull. de Animâ cap. 49.* (b) *Iren. lib. 1. cap. 20.*
(c) See *Epist. Disc. pag. 93.* and the Observation here made thereon, *Chap. 2. Sect. 18.*

embrace his Doctrine, are thereby entitled to an happy Immortality ; and if any shall hear it, but embrace it not, they are caught nevertheless by their bare hearing of it, and by that betray'd into an unhappy one. These are those Primitive Christians, betwixt whose and Mr. *Dodwel's* Notions, there is indeed, as he is pleas'd to observe, a very strange agreement. For being Heretics, and not Heathens, *i. e.* being Pretenders to a Christianity of some sort, they did not entirely deny, (as *Tertullian* has observ'd) though most of them have new model'd the Perpetuity of the Soul. (a) *Animæ Salutem* (says he) *credo retractatu carere. Omnes enim ferè Hæretici eam quoquo modo velint, tamen non negant.* One only of that sort, and him indeed a very primitive one, we read of in (b) *Enlogius* ; viz. *Dosthen* or *Dositheus*, a Contemporary of *Simon Magus*. This worthy Pattern of Antiquity, was a Teacher, we are told, of the Soul's Mortality ; though we hear nothing at the same time, by what *Salvo* he would qualifie his Doctrine. But 'tis observable, that this Doctrine is not there call'd *Catholic* by *Enlogius*, though

(a) *Tertull. de Resur. carnis, cap. 2.* (b) See *Photius, cod. 230. col. 887.*

Mr. *Dodwel* can allow it that title in *Arnobius* ; nor is it intimated to be a *Divine reasoning*, as Mr. *Dodwel* is pleas'd to honour it in *Tatian* ; but 'tis describ'd by a peculiar word, which I shall not scruple hence-forward to appropriate to Mr. *Dodwel's* Title Page ; viz. *ἑδρατώ τῷ ψυχῇ ἐπε-επαλόγη*. i. e. *He taught a Doctrine, next kin to a Prodigy* ; by which the Soul is to be accounted Mortal.

55. Who would now imagine that a Scholar, an Antiquarian, a late eminent Member of the Church of *England*, should come forth against that, and against all other Churches, back'd with such *Instructors*, and such *Authorities* as these ? Yet lo ! these are the *Masters*, and this is the *Disciple*, to whom we must resign our dearest Interest in this, or in the other World ; the pretence of being a Catholic and Apostolic Church. (a) This is he who has stumbled most unfortunately upon the very Expression of the Ninth Canon, and call'd the whole Church of *England*, as such, a number of *profane Persons*. (b) This is he, whose successful labours have discover'd a new Charter for the Hierarchi-

(a) See his *Paranesis*, pag. 5. and 224. (b) *Paranesis*, pag. 15. &c.

cal Government of the Church. (a) This is he, upon whose Reasonings we are to believe, that our Saviour did not die, till he had exceeded Thirty-eight Years of Age. (b) This is he, by whose Authority we are to quit the old, and to accept of new terms for our subscribing to the Canon of Holy Scripture. In a word, This is he, with whom all Mankind is born in order to be annihilated ; and, unless he models the Communion, baptiz'd in order to be damn'd.

56. See here a chain of many rare inimitable productions, wonderfully resembling one another in Paradox and Singularity, and confessing their Original from the same Brain. But the last, with which we are now principally concern'd, is so extraordinary an assertion, that neglecting all directer Reasonings, I might have answer'd it from the beginning, in a manner altogether as extraordinary. I might have argued, I mean, against all the espousers of it, as *St. Paul* (c) thought fit to argue against the deniers of a Resurrection : insisting, that the consequences were so horrid, the premisses were impossible to be true. For

(a) *Dissert. on Irenæus*, p. 82. &c. (b) See the whole
first *Dissert. on Iren.* (c) 1 Cor. 15. 14, &c.

if these are indeed justifiable Pretences, then is our Preaching vain, and the Faith of our Church is vain ; then are we found false Witnesses of God, and contrary to what has hitherto been believ'd and taught, millions that are fall'n asleep are perish'd. But these are those concessions which we are as unwilling to make to Mr. *Dodwel*, as *Cicero* was to make them, to the like intolerable Innovators, even of his Time, and in his Religion. *Neq; enim iis assentior* (says he) *qui hæc nuper differere ceperunt, cum corporibus simul animos interire, atq; omnia morte deleri. Plus apud me antiquorum autoritas valet, vel nostrorum majorum, qui mortuis tam religiosa jura tribuerunt : quod non fecissent profecto, si nihil ad eos pertinere arbitrarentur. Cic. de amicit.* No ! we can never consent to quit all the Privileges of our Christianity, to resign our Interest in Christ, and the Benefits of Christ, to suspect the validity of our Sacraments, to renounce the Tradition of our Ancestors, to question our succession from the first Fathers and Planters of our Faith, and to think the good thing, which they have committed to us, an empty Name. These certainly are Prerogatives too dear to be given up at once, to a Head so wrong turn'd, and a Pen so exasperated by

by Schism : much more, after we have consented to join with him in a fair hearing of Antiquity, and after he has been formally condemn'd by every venerable Authority, but supported by such only as were the Scandals of their time.

57. Thus, as (in the foregoing Chapter) I have accus'd, not the Man, but his Opinions, of a monstrous Heresy, in as much as they plainly derogate from the receiv'd Creeds and Canons of the Church ; so (in this) I have continued the same Charge against the same Opinions, in as much as after a vain aspiring, by Blunder, by Torture, and by Falsification, to draw the purest Antiquity to his Favour, their Author fell so low in the attempt, as to sink in the very dregs of the most nauseous and pernicious Heresies. Now all that I have advanc'd on these Heads, has been submitted, with utmost deference, to the Judgment of my Superiors in the Church. But the few following Considerations are those of which I shall desire to make our Adversary himself the Judge. For 'tis to him at length, that I presume to address myself, conjuring him, instead of being offended at the Exhortation, to consult his own and the Churches Peace, in three short Particulars.

I. Let

I. Let him consider therefore *in the first place*, Whether he is not conscious to himself of a certain habitual proneness to Singularity of Opinion : Whether he is not sensible that this proneness to Singularity, is in him accompanied with two very improper and very unhappy Qualities, *viz.* a natural and acquir'd darkness of Understanding, the same which is call'd, in *Tatian*, *ἡσυχία καὶ ἀνομία* by *Epiphanius* : And whether upon these two accounts, he ought not to have a special guard upon himself, how he ventures upon treading new Paths, and starting new Discoveries ; that being a Province much fitter for *Socinus*, and other Heads of that sort ; to whom, if God has permitted the same desire, he has given withal more dangerous abilities, for the carrying on of Paradoxes and Innovations in Religion.

II. Let him consider *in the next place*, Whether the Points, in which he ventures to singularize after a very free and authoritative manner, are not of the utmost consequence towards the Eternal Welfare of Mankind, *viz.* the Soul's State after Death, the Canon of Holy Scripture, and the terms of a salvable Communion. If so ; then let him farther judge, which is most likely to be true ; *viz.* *That God should*

should tie the Salvation of precious Souls to the knowledge of several dark and obscure Truths, such as some great labourer in Criticism and Chronology shall once perhaps discover in a thousand Years; or, That this is his practice only, of hanging the weightiest Conclusions upon the slenderest Reasons, and venting his own Schemes for God's Counsels, and Covenants with Mankind.

III. But let him consider likewise *in the last place*, Whether, upon the event of the foregoing Controversy, he ought not to reflect, with some remorse, upon his own flat opposition to the two last Articles of so many authentic Creeds: Whether it does not a little startle him, to observe his boasted Authority of the Fathers, proceeding all along upon palpable Mistakes of their Expression, upon Quotations of foreign Passages, and upon a concealment of those pertinent ones that decide the Question: And lastly, whether he has not now the mortification, of seeing his bold, judicial, condemnatory Hypothesis, not only abjur'd by every Catholic Doctor, but on the other side, conspiring most harmoniously with the confess'd Disguises of *Socinus*, the *Rhapsodies* of *Gobar*, the Fundamental Principle of *Pelagius*, the *Schismatical* Pretences of the *Donatists*, and the Cant of the whole *Gnostic* Heresy.

A N-

ANNOTATIONS.

FOR the further clearing or confirming of some foregoing Passages in this Discourse, I shall here note the few following Particulars, which for more brevity, or better order, have been omitted in the Work it self.

ANNO T. I.

Concerning the new Proclamation of War against the Devil.

I. [Chap. 2. §. 19.] **I***n this Section I have observed that Mr. Dodwel's Notion concerning the Devil's not being proclaim'd a public Enemy till Christ's last Commission to his Disciples, is nothing but a Socinian discovery : tho' Justin Martyr has indeed asserted, that the Devil knew not of his own condemnation till that time. I here think fit to add, that whoever may have been the Author of it, 'tis a very false and groundless Observation. This is plain from that very Passage of the Book of Wisdom,*
which

which gave occasion to the Socinian Comment; through Envy of the Devil came Death into the World : and they that do hold of his side, do find it, (cap. 2. v. 24.) For here the Devil and his Party are consider'd as under a declar'd and notorious Enmity, not only without, but before any Gospel publication. To this, and to that Sentiment I have before hinted from Josephus, if we add some authentic Testimonies of the Primitive Christian Church, they all jointly conspire to ruine this novel Notion : tho' 'tis the only one, by which Mr. Dodwel has accounted, for his supposing any Human Souls Immortaliz'd, by the exprefs Pleasure of God, to Punishment. Were therefore Tatian of as good credit with the Catholic Church, as he seems to be with Mr. Dodwel, I would observe what he has said at large (Page 27, 28. Ed. Oxon) to this purpose. But I choose rather to insist upon this ample profession of S. Irenæus, Ἐκ ποτὲ καὶ ἀποστασίας ὁ ἀγγέλων [ἔργων] καὶ ἐχθρὸς, ἀπὸ ὅτε ἐξήλωσε τὸ πλάσμα τοῦ Θεοῦ... διὰ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ αὐτὸς... καὶ ἀποστασία τὸ ζιζάνιον... ἀφαιρῶν τὴν ἰδίαν μεσσίαν, &c. Iren. l. 4. c. 78. These words plainly imply a declar'd Enmity, and a formal act of proscription against the Devil ever since the Fall of Adam ; and the consequences of such a proscription are thus likewise noted by S. Cyprian (de exhort. mart.)

Ad-

Adversarius vetus est, & hostis antiquus cum quo prælium gerimus. Sex millia annorum jam pene complentur, (*says he, according to a computation we are not concern'd to justifie*) ex quo Hominem Diabolus impugnat.

ANNOT. II.

Concerning the Distinction betwixt Soul and Spirit.

II. [Chap. 3. §. 4.] **T**IS in that Section, that I took the first opportunity of speaking to Mr. Dodwel's distinction betwixt Soul and Spirit, advancing what was then necessary on this Head for carrying on the thread of my Discourse. But this being his constant refuge to which he has recourse, on all occasions, for shelter to an unwarrantable Hypothesis, 'twill for that reason deserve a larger Comment in this place. This distinction therefore is to be trac'd originally from that known division of our Human Nature into Body, Soul and Spirit. Now this may be jointly attributed to the Platonic and the Mosaic Theology. In the Platonic Theology, Plato himself has gave no farther occasion to it, than as in his Timæus he describes the Frame of the Macrocosm,

crocosm, or of the whole Universe, in this manner : Νέν μὲν ἐν ψυχῇ, ψυχὴν δὲ ἐν σώματι συνίσταται τὸ πᾶν ζυνετακταίνον. *For, as he is speaking of the Microcosm, or the Frame of Man, in other frequent Passages of his Works, he conceives that, as compounded only of Soul and Body, and the νῦς as being the better part, i. e. the Governour, or the Charioteer, in the composition of the Soul. In the Mosaic Theology the eldest Hint we know of, truly favourable to this distinction betwixt Soul and Spirit, is to be met with in the Septuagint Version of Deuteronomy, (cap. 6. v. 5.) where we read Ἀγαπήσεις κρείον ἢ Θεόν σε ἡ ὄψις ἡ διανοίας σου, καὶ ἡ ὄψις ἡ ψυχὴ σου :* Especially as those words are warranted, by being incorporated into St. Mark, and the term διανοίας expressly interpreted of συνέσις, i. e. the Understanding, or Rational Faculty of our Soul, (cap 12. v. 31, 33.) From these Authorities in the Mosaic and Platonic Theology, the resolution of our whole Human Frame into Body, Soul and Spirit, grew common with the Writers who copied after them. Philo, who studied both, is very express as to this division, varying the terms only betwixt χῆρ and σῶμα, νῦς and πνεῦμα, according as he had the Hea-then or the Divine Authority in view. This may be seen at large in that Treatise of his, Quod deterior potiori insidiari soleat, (pag.

170, &c. (Ed. Par. & Franc. 1691.) and in a more concise Passage, which I shall here transcribe out of another Work, (viz. Quirer. divinar. Hæres pag. 521.) Δορυφρεῖται τὸ σῶμα διδδξία καὶ πεισίσφ καὶ ἀφθονία πλάτε. Ψυχὴ δὲ τὸ τῷ σῶμα ὁλοκλήρῳ καὶ κατὰ πάντα ὑμνήῳ. ὁ δὲ οὗτος ἔσθ' ἐν ταῖς ἐπισήμαις διασημάτων. They who know how punctual an agreement is to be observ'd betwixt some passages of St. Paul and this Writer, will not wonder if the Apostle has accommodated himself to the same way of speaking, when in his First Epistle to the Thessalonians, (c. 5. v. 23.) he describes likewise our ὁλοκλήρῳ, by πνεῦμα, ψυχὴ and σῶμα. Nay, in his Epistle to the Hebrews (c. 4. v. 12.) he speaks of the two former as separable from one another: not only Philo (as I shall shew) but the Translator of the Book of Job, having likewise preceded him in that (c. 7. v. 15.) and said, Ἀπαλλάξεις ὑπὸ πνεύματος μου τὴν ψυχὴν μου.

If now a few Heathen Authorities have made this division familiar to Plotinus and other Platonists, no wonder that being strengthen'd by this concurrence of the Septuagint of Philo, and St. Paul, it has been accepted by so many Christian Fathers; those especially who were educated in the Study of the same Philosophy. Thus therefore S. Justin, in his *Treatise de Resurrectione*, (Gr. Spicil. Sec. 2.

pag. 192.) διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὸ σῶμα ψυχῆς, πνεῦμα δὲ ψυχῆς
 οὐκ ἔστι, or as it undoubtedly should be read
 πνεῦμα οὐκ ἔστι ψυχῆς. Thus too S. Irenæus :
 (lib. 5. cap. 9.) Perfectus Homo constat carne
 Anima & Spiritu ; & altero quidem sal-
 vante & figurante qui est Spiritus, altero
 quod unitur & formatur quod est caro. Id
 vero quod inter hæc est duo, est Anima.
 Thus lastly Origen : (in Epist. ad Rom.) Tri-
 plex Hominis portio, Corpus seu Caro,
 infima pars nostrî ... Spiritus, quo Divinæ
 Naturæ similitudinem exprimimus ... Porro
 tertia, & inter ea media, anima, &c.

*Thus much for the History of this distin-
 ction betwixt Soul and Spirit, as it is to be
 observ'd from such Authorities as indeed are
 venerable, without tracing it in Tatian or
 Trismegistus, or others of an inferiour stamp.
 I now come to take away from Mr. Dodwel,
 the whole use he would make of this distin-
 ction by two following Observations : The First
 of which proves it to be in it self needless, and
 the other, foreign to this purpose. For,*

*First, As this distinction is founded upon
 nothing else but the division of our Human
 Frame into Body, Soul and Spirit ; so 'tis
 observable, that the other receiv'd division of
 our Frame, viz. barely into Soul and Body,
 is equally warrantable from each of the fore-
 going Authors. Hence the distinction betwixt
 Soul and Spirit was never thought so sacred,
 or*

or so exact, but that as soon as it should be employ'd to any ill purpose, it might be quit-
 ted, without any Injury either to Faith or Reason. Thus when Tertullian had to do with those Gnostic Heretics, who (in terms that much resemble this Hypothesis of Mr. Dodwel) nescio quod spiritale semen infulciunt Animæ, he abandons the distinction betwixt Anima and Spiritus, as the Christians stated it ; or betwixt Anima and Animus, as 'twas stated by the Heathens ; and argues at large against it in the 10th, 11th and 12th Chapters of his Book de Animâ. Si separas Spiritum & Animam (says he) separa & opera, &c. si duo sunt Anima & Spiritus, dividi possent ... sed nullo modo eveniet. Ergo duo non erunt, quæ dividi non possunt. And again, Animum ita dicimus Animæ concretum, non ut substantiâ alium, sed ut substantiæ officium. But what was here the single case of Tertullian, was afterwards the case of the whole Church, when Apollinaris founded his Heresy on this distinction between Soul and Spirit ; and would from thence affirm (as Vincentius Lirinensis has represented his Opinion) in ipsa salvatoris nostri Carne aut Animam Humanam penitus non fuisse, aut certè talem fuisse cui Mens & Ratio non esset. That he warranted this rare Doctrine

from this, as his fundamental Principle, we are told very succinctly by Nemefius. Τίνας μὲν, εἶν ὅτι καὶ Πλωτίνῳ, ἄλλην εἶναι τὴν ψυχὴν, καὶ ἄλλαν τὴν νῦν δογματίσαντες, ἐκ τειῶν τὴν ἀνθρώπου συνεσθάναι βέλονται σώματι καὶ ψυχῇ καὶ νῦν : οἷς ἠκολέθησε καὶ Ἀπολλινάριος, ὁ τὴν Λαοδικείας ἀρχιεπίσκοπος. τῶτον γὰρ παξάμενος τὴν διμέλιον τὴν οἰκίαν δόξης καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ περικοδόμησε κατὰ τὸ οἰκῆον δόγμα. Nem. pag. 2. i. e. Some, among whom is Plotinus, having espous'd an Opinion of the Soul's being one thing, and the Spirit another, will have Man to consist of three parts, viz. Body, Soul and Spirit. These have been follow'd by Apollinarius, once Bishop of Laodicea ; for he having fix'd this Foundation of his own Sentiments, soon fram'd the rest agreeable to those peculiar thoughts. Upon this account Athanasius professedly rejected the distinction betwixt Soul and Spirit, that so he might take away this mischievous handle from the Apollinarian Heresy. But Mr. Dodwel (as I have amply shewn) has put this Heretical Tool into the hands of that Father ; and contrary to matter of Fact, to the nature of that Controversy, and to the apparent words of Athanasius, pretends that he refuted the Apollinarians, by distinguishing, as he does, betwixt the ψυχή and πνεῦμα. Let him make the best Apology he is able for this Injury to the Church, and
to

to the Memory of a blessed Father : in the mean while let us observe how much, from the current of those times, this distinction was universally exploded, 'till reviv'd in this latter Age by him, and by Socinus. For whoever was the Author of that Treatise (among the Works of S. Augustine) de Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus, he reproves this distinction as very singular, at that time, in Didymus. Duabus substantiis tantum constat Homo, animâ & corpore. — Non est tertius in substantiâ Hominis Spiritus, sicut Didymus contendit, sed Spiritus ipsa est Anima, &c. This therefore was the first Observation, by which we are to render the distinction betwixt Soul and Spirit, useless to Mr. Dodwel, namely, that 'twas of so little validity in it self, and so unnecessary to be believ'd, either in Nature or Religion, that as time and occasion serv'd, it was freely abandon'd by the Church. But,

Secondly, There is yet another Observation as effectual to the same purpose, and which must necessarily deprive Mr. Dodwel of all the Advantage he would draw from this distinction between Soul and Spirit. For the use he would make of this distinction, is to prove that the Soul is a Principle natural to all Men ; but that the Spirit is an adventitious Principle, acquir'd to the perfect Man

alone, at his participation of a regular Baptism. Now quite contrary to all this, the Soul and Spirit, as distinguish'd by the several foregoing Authors, are suppos'd, in each of these, to be equal ingredients of our Nature; and the Spirit, as well as Soul, is made common to the whole Race of Mankind, by vertue of the Creation of the first Man, and the Birth of all the rest. This at first sight must be allow'd concerning the foregoing distinction of Soul and Spirit, except only as it occurs in St. Paul. But that it holds no less in him than in the other Authors I have alleged, will appear, I hope, from this very fortunate Demonstration. 'Tis an exact parallel, which long before this I have observ'd, betwixt those words of his, Heb. 4. 12. and a Passage of Philo, in his Quis rerum Divin. Hæres, pag. 499. St. Paul is there speaking of the λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, asserting it to be τομώτερον ὡς πᾶσαν υἰαχαιαν, and observing that it διαιρεῖται ἄχει μεισμὲ ψυχῆς τὴ καὶ πνεύματος. Philo is likewise speaking of the Τομὴς ἢ συμπάντων Θεοῦ λόγος, and observing that it διαρεῖ μέσον τιῶ ψυχὴν εἰς λογικὸν καὶ ἄλογον. These Expressions (as I shall perhaps observe more largely in another Work) must needs have been deriv'd from some one common fountain, some Theological Commentaries which St. Paul might have read at the Feet of Gamaliel, and which
were

were studied in common by the Learned of that Church and Age. At present only I insist, that the λογικὸν and ἄλογον ψυχῆς in Philo, is the ψυχή and πνεῦμα in St. Paul, and that therefore that division in our Apostle, is only another way of expressing the two natural Faculties of our Soul, its rational and its sensitive branch, or all that is an ingredient in our frame, besides the Body. If now the ψυχή and πνεῦμα in St. Paul, and in other Christian Authors, is no more than the ψυχή and νῆς in Plato, and other Heathen ones ; and if by the πνεῦμα, (i.e. the Spirit) is in all of them undeniably to be understood, not an adventitious, but a natural Principle in our Constitution ; what at length is the use that Mr. Dodwel would make of this distinction ? No ; 'tis not among the sound and venerable Authors of any sort, that he can trace the footsteps of his adventitious, adscititious Nature : 'tis among the Gnostics and other Heretics, as I have before shewn in this Discourse ; and among others of equal Reputation, which I shall here as freely resign to him ; viz. the Pious and Learned Doctors of the Cabbalistic Tribe. 'Tis these who have divided Human Soul, not into three, but even into five subtile branches, viz. the Nephesch, the Ruach, the Neschamah, the Chaiah, and the Jechidah. Of these, the three first

are parallel to what we before understood by $\Psi\chi\eta$ and $\piνεῦμα$, the fifth is a mystical Presence of the Deity, and 'tis in the fourth at length that we find Mr. Dodwel's higher adventitious Principle. For this is the explication of the Cant : Vitalitas quædam sublimior, ab extra Homini superveniens, nec intrinsecus tantum eundem penetrans, sed & extrinsecus ambiens, quam Christus denominare videtur appellatione Vitæ Æternæ. Vid. *Kabbalam denudatam*, Part 3. p. 247. as cited by Fr. Buddeus, in his *Introd. ad Histor. Philos. Ebræor.* But I here close this Comment on the distinction betwixt Soul and Spirit ; highly satisfied with observing, that they are the Dreams only of Gnosticism and Cabbalism, which this Gentleman has utter'd against the Church.

A N N O T. III.

Concerning that Axiom of Plato, $\Psi\chi\eta$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\upsilon$ $\alpha\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, as, with a small variation, 'tis cited from his *Phædrus* by S. Justin.

III. [Chap. 3. §. 12.] **I** Have there produc'd that profess'd Axiom of Plato, $\Psi\chi\eta$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\upsilon$ $\alpha\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, as reported by Justin Martyr in his *Cohortatio ad Græcos*. And to justify the Translation which I have there

there affix'd, viz. All the Soul, or the whole Soul of Man is Immortal, I shall now transcribe this intire Passage from the 7th Section of that Work. Πλάτων μὲν τεμνέει ψυχὴν εἶναι φησι· καὶ τὸ μὲν, λογικὸν αὐτῆς, τὸ δὲ θυμικόν, τὸ δὲ ὀπίσθιον εἶναι λέγει. Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ἐκ κοινότεραν πᾶσι ψυχὴν εἶναι φησιν, ἐν ᾗ ἀφαιρηθῇ καὶ τὰ φθαρτὰ μόρια, ἀλλὰ τὸ λογικὸν μόνον· καὶ ὁ μὲν Πλάτων ψυχὴν πᾶσαν ἀθάνατον, κέκραγα λέγων· Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ, ἐντελέχειαν αὐτῷ ὀνομαζών, ἐκ ἀθάνατον ἀλλὰ ἐν τὴν αὐτὴν εἶναι βέβηλαι. 'Tis the only intent of this Passage to observe, that Aristotle conceiv'd the Soul as a single, and that a purely rational Principle, yet in it self Mortal : but that Plato conceiv'd it as a triple Principle, comprehending an irascible, concupiscible, and a rational part, yet in the whole Immortal : While Justin Martyr kept the middle betwixt these two Extreams, consenting to call the two last parts corruptible or mortal, and, by that very thing, implying the first to be Immortal. Whether S. Justin has here truly represented either Plato or Aristotle, I am not concern'd to say. 'Tis enough that the very import and diction of the Passage must oblige us to construe πᾶσα ψυχὴ as I have done ; i. e. to understand it here of an Integral, not of a Generical Whole. I add only, for the confirming of my Observation, that πᾶσα ψυχὴ is common, both with Plato and Aristotle in the same sense : with Plato ; when in his Phædrus he says,

πᾶσα

πᾶσα τὸ πᾶσα ἢν περὶ αὐτῆς, *and in his Ninth de Republ.* φιλοσόφῳ ἐπιμύθῳ αἰ πᾶσις τῆ ψυχῆς, &c. *But with Aristotle 'tis more familiar in his Books de Animâ ; particularly when he puts this Question, (lib. 1. c. 5.)* ἐπιμύθῳ τὸ γινώσκον ψυχῆς ὅτι, καὶ τὸ αἰσθάνον, ἐπὶ τὸ ὁμιλοῦν, πότερον ὅλη τῇ ψυχῇ τίτων ἐνέσθαι ὑπάρχει, καὶ πᾶσι νοῦμιν τὴ καὶ αἰσθάνοντα, ἢ μορίοις ἐτέροις ἑτέροις. *But to this may be added a Passage that is yet fuller to our purpose in his Metaphysics, (lib. 12. cap. 3.) and which will indeed justify him from having thought so hardly of the Soul, as is above suppos'd by Justin Martyr. For speaking there incidental-ly concerning the survival of the Soul, it survives, says he, μὴ πᾶσα, ἀλλ' ὁ νῦν πᾶσαν γὰρ αἰδύνα-τον ἴσως. Accordingly he is introduc'd by a Modern Greek Author, thus accounting for his own Opinions, concerning the Immortality of the Soul. ἐκ αὐτῆς πᾶσα θνητὴ ἢ πᾶσα αἰδύναται, καὶ ἐμὴ. Ἀλλ' αἰδύναται μὴ ἡ λογικὴ ψυχὴ μόνον, ἢ δ' ἀλογ. θνητὴ πᾶσα καὶ αὐτῇ. See Athanasius Rhet. de Immort. Animæ, lib. 2.*

A N N O T. IV.

Concerning the word Soul as equivocal, and the Sentiments of J. Martyr relating to our better part.

IV. [Page III. & 112.] **C**onsidering that the word Soul, betwixt the Platonic and Aristotelian Schemes, was become equivocal in S. Justin's time, I have therefore col-

collected his Opinion from his accounts of what, (to avoid Equivocation) may be call'd our Better Part. For if with him (in his Treatise of the Resurrection) we conceive the whole Man as a *τεμερὴς ὁλότητα*, i. e. as consisting of *σῶμα*, *ψυχὴ*, and *πνεῦμα* : in that composition there is a better part, viz. the *πνεῦμα*. And of this he there lays it down as an unquestion'd Principle, that *πνεῦμα ἔστι ἀθάνατον*. If on the other side with the same Author, (in his Cohort. ad Græcos) we conceive the Soul alone as *τεμερὴς*, i. e. as consisting of a *λογικόν*, *θυμικόν*, and *ἡθθυμικόν μέγεθος* : in this composition there likewise is a better part, viz. the *λογικόν μέγεθος*, or the rational branch of the Soul. But this he has pronounced Immortal in as full a manner, viz. by not reckoning it among those branches, which in the Passage above-cited he calls Mortal. From hence therefore it must be allow'd, that the word *ψυχὴ* is liable to various Acceptations in S. Justin's Writings : but if his meaning be distinctly examin'd, he will be found to have asserted no more than this one common Truth, from two different Hypotheses, viz. That the sensitive Soul is indeed Mortal, but that the rational is Immortal. For in the first Hypothesis the sensitive Soul is express'd simply by *ψυχὴ* as contradistinct to *πνεῦμα*, and in the second by the *θυμικόν* and *ἡθθυμικόν μέγεθος* as contradistinct to the *λογικόν*. A N-

ANNOT. V.

Concerning that famous Passage of *Plato* in his *Timæus*, and the citation of it by *S. Justin*.

V. [Chap. 3. §. 15.] **I** Have there observ'd that the famous Passage of *Plato* in his *Timæus*, ἐπίπερ νέμειται, &c. is put into the mouth of the Novice, and not of the Genius, who personates his Instructor; and that therefore 'tis not quoted as an Authority, nor with any mark of Approbation by *S. Justin*. To confirm this, let it be here farther noted, that in his *Cohortatio ad Græcos* (Sect. 23.) he disputes directly against that Passage, condemning it as contradictory and inconsistent with it self: tho' *Gobar* from this, and from the other places I have before hinted, took occasion to charge such an inconsistency on *S. Justin*. But as *Photius* truly argues, the Martyr is there disproving the Heathen Hypothesis; and excepting particularly against the use which *Plato* makes of that Axiom, πᾶν τὸ γινώσκον φθαρτὸν: i. e. All created Beings must be Mortal. And this *S. Justin* does upon the same view as *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Metho-*
dius and *Lactantius* have likewise done, viz.
least

least such a Principle should derogate from the perpetuity of Human Soul, which Christians deny indeed to be innata & infecta, but profess notwithstanding that 'tis æterna.

ANNO T. VI.

Concerning the same Passage, and the Inference to be made from thence.

VI. [Page 115. & 117.] **T**Here discoursing of the same Passage, I speak of Plato as retrenching something of his Opinion concerning the Soul's absolute Immortality, by his denying such an Immortality to the lesser Gods. But this I would be understood to do, not from my own mind, but as accounting for the mind of S. Justin in this place; and as the denial of so great a Privilege to superior Beings, may be construed to deny it likewise to the inferior. For so an Author, of great Authority with Mr. Dodwel, Arnobius I mean, reasons from this Passage: Quid Animas admiramini mediæ dici qualitatis a nobis; cum numinibus ipsis dicat Plato medias esse naturas, sed continuam & inocciduam vitam principali beneficio subrogari? (Arnob. lib. 2.) Yet because this is a Reasoning I admit not of,

of, and because I esteem such a Mortality of the lesser Gods, whom Plato considers but as so many Divine Animals, to be reconcilable with what he says concerning the Immortality of Divine and Human Soul ; I therefore intreat the Reader to correct those words of the 117th Page, Line 21, 22, 23, after this manner ;

With those Thoughts of Plato in his *Timæus*, concerning all dependent and precarious Beings, according to which the Soul seems to have no title to an *αἰωνοία*, but to a derivative *αἰδανοία* only, &c.

A N N O T. VII.

Concerning Mr. *Dodwel's* Hypothesis, as never mention'd in the Disputes betwixt St. *Cyprian* and the *Novatian* Heretics.

VII. [Chap. 3. §. 38.] **T**IS at the close of this Section that I take a due Advantage of the remarkable silence of S. *Cyprian* concerning this whole mysterious Hypothesis of Mr. *Dodwel*, alleging that if the Church of Christ had indeed this important privilege of conferring an Immortalizing Principle to the Souls of all who duly receive its Baptism, this must needs have

have been pleaded by that Father against Novatian, in order to invalidate his, and to magnify the Baptism of the Church. I now think fit to add, that had there been so much as a notion of such a Power in the Christian Church, it would have been urg'd no less on the other side by Novatian against St. Cyprian. For that Arch-Puritan claim'd to his Party only the prerogative of administering a valid and effectual Baptism, and, by consequence, must have appropriated to himself this boasted Power of turning the Souls of Men from Mortal into Immortal Beings. But far from such a pretence as this, ascribing only to our Body an Immortality of Happiness, by the Power of the Holy Ghost, he attributes an Immortality of Being to the Soul of every individual Man, by Virtue, not of Baptism, but of its own proper Constitution. This is his express Doctrine, when commenting on that Text of St. Matthew, (cap. 10. v. 28.) ... Hanc habet generositatem Immortalitatis Anima in quovis Homine ut non possit interfici, &c.— And again, Nec Mors in illis Animam perimit quæ Corpora ipsa dissolvit ; jus enim suum exercere potuit in Corpora, in Animas exercere non valuit : aliud enim in illis Mortale, & ideo mortuum : aliud in illis Immortale, & ideo intelligitur non extinctum.

See

(See Novatian de Trinitate, cap. 20. & 29.)
Yet this is here urg'd, not as any Authority of Novatian, but only as an Historical Evidence, that this strange Power of Immortalizing Souls was as yet a secret in those Primitive Times. For it is not my practice to recur to Heretical Testimonies, as Mr. Dodwel does. Novatian however has said one very remarkable Truth, of which his own unhappy Experience soon after made him an authentic Witness. And 'tis what, in the close of this present Work, I would charitably request Mr. Dodwel to reflect upon; viz. Erroris semper est abrupta dementia, & non est novum si usq; ad periculosa descendunt qui fidem legitimam reliquerunt.

The End of the First Part.

E R R A T A.

PAge 68. Line 24. for 26. read 261. p. 111. l. 16. for *an* *Immortalizing* r. *a Natural Immortal.* p. 112. l. 22. for *be his* r. *be by his.* p. 116. after *Σιδε*, add *χὲ διὰ τοῦτο Σιδε*. p. 118. l. 20. dele (*the*) at the end. p. 121. l. 30. for *ἡμῶν* r. *ἡμῶν.* p. 129. l. 28. for c. 16. r. c. 29.

THE
CONTENTS
OF
The foregoing Chapters.

CHAP. I. Or Introduction.

MR. Dodwel's Hypothesis, tho' in it self strange and surprizing, is yet to be accounted for, from the Character of his Writings, and from the natural tendency of his Schism, (§. 1, 2.) 'Tis not to be palliated by any pretence of Piety or Learning, (3.) But on those accounts rather to be oppos'd more zealously, (4.) Its Mischiefs are briefly hinted, (5.) and compar'd with Opinions of other Men, always censur'd as prejudicial to Religion, (6, 7.) An accusation is now brought against it as Heretical, (8.) To prevent which, being frustrated by evasions, his Hypothesis is clearly stated, and reduc'd to seven Propositions, (9, 10.) The
R last

The Contents.

last of these is observ'd to be uncharitable beyond expression, and to fall in with the pretences of the Donatists, (11, 12.) But the six first are now divided into primary and secondary Assertions: of which the secondary are to be incidentally consider'd; but the primary ones, relating to the Condition of the Soul, to be attack'd directly by a triple Charge of Heresy: (13, 14, 15, 16.) i. e. First, as contrary to several Forms of Faith, allow'd by the concurrent consent of all Churches in the World. (17.) Secondly, as contrary to the Tradition of the purest Antiquity, and that in the judgment of those very Fathers, to which Mr. Dodwel has appeal'd. (18.) Thirdly, as contrary to the clear and unconfested Doctrine of Holy Scripture, tho' strain'd and tortur'd by Mr. Dodwel to the contrary purpose (19.)

C H A P. II.

That the Soul in general is Mortal; that any particular Souls shall ever actually die, or any Bodies never rise from the Dead, are Heretical Opinions, bar'd by the careful provision of the Church in its forms of Faith, or in its occasional Censures of those, and other parallel Innovations, (§. I.) They are derogatory to one antient Creed, registred by
St.

The Contents.

St. Irénæus, and another by Tertullian, (2.) to the intent and receiv'd Exposition of the Apostles Creed, (3.) to the plain expression of the African, the Hierosolomitan and the Constantinopolitan Creeds, (4.) but more notoriously to the ample profession of that called the Athanasian, (5, 6.) The same Opinions are liable to several known Censures of the Church : that particularly publish'd against the Arabian Heresy, (7.) that likewise of the eighth Session in the last Lateran Council, (8.) and that contained in two Articles of the Church of England under R. Edv. 6. (9.) They are farther liable to another sort of Heresy, as by distinguishing betwixt a Catholic and Schismatical Baptism ; they allow to the former a vertue of immortalizing Souls ; but deny the same vertue to the latter, and so (contrary to the repeated decisions of the Church) make the former a valid, but the latter an invalid Baptism, (10, 11, 12, 13.) The hints and supports of these Opinions are borrow'd from Socinus, betwixt whom and Mr. Dodwel, there now follow seven exact parallels, (14, 15.) For Mr. Dodwel's Epistolary Discourse agrees with that of Socinus de Mortalitate primi Hominis, in denying the Soul's natural Mortality, (16.) in affirming the actual Death of Souls unacquainted with the Gospel, (17.) in a subtil evasion

The Contents.

or a direct defiance of the Consequences chargeable on their Doctrine, (18.) in the strange notion of a Proclamation publish'd against the Devil, (19.) in the Explication of the several Scriptural Proofs brought for the confirmation of these Opinions, (20.) in the Pelagian Position of Man being created necessarily Mortal, (21.) and lastly, in the whole Socinian Hypothesis, concerning the Nature and Condition of the Soul, (22.) After which follows a recapitulation of the materials of this Chapter, (23.) and an Observation on that contagious Heresy into which Mr. Dodwel seems to be, not unjustly, fall'n.

C H A P. III.

The Question concerning the Soul's natural Mortality, is examin'd by the Tradition of the purest Antiquity, more particularly as it is to be collected from those Authors, that have been alleg'd by Mr. Dodwel, (§. 1.) This is introduc'd with a consideration of the Hellenist Jews and Platonists, and a Proof that they not only believ'd the Soul naturally Immortal, but that their terms and notions were a good ground-work for the like Sentiments in the Church, (2, 3, 4, 5.) The Heathen Theology is likewise vindicated from its being thought favourable to the Soul's natural Mortality,

The Contents.

Mortality, (6, 7.) This premis'd, the Cause is put upon an appeal to the Testimony of the Christian Fathers, and first of all, to that of S. Justin Martyr, (8.) He is consider'd as having been before misrepresented in this point, more particularly by Stephen Gobar, an ancient Heretic, who has furnish'd us beyond expectation, with some particular thoughts and expressions of Mr. Dodwel, (9.) The Passages urg'd from Justin Martyr, are found only in a short Episode of his, wrote by way of Dialogue betwixt himself, as a Novice, and a Genius, as his Instructor in Religion. But the caution there given against applying the word ἀθάνατος, i. e. Immortal, to the Soul, is to prevent its being believ'd αἰώνιος, or increate, for that those words were consignant in some Authors, and the Soul really taught to be αἰώνιος καὶ ἀθάνατος, i. e. innata & eterna, or increate as well as immortal, by the Platonists, and other Heathen Sects, (10, 11.) ἐκ συνδράκου πᾶσι τοῖς ψυχαῖς, construed, (in opposition to Mr. Dodwel) that Souls do not altogether die, agreeably to non omnis moriar in Horace, and the Phrase of ψυχὴ πᾶσι, i. e. the whole Soul, as it occurs in our present Author, and in Lactantius, (§. 12. to be compared with §. 41. and Annot. III.) S. Justin's other Explications of himself are conceal'd industriously by Mr. Dodwel, (13,

The Contents.

(13, 14.) *Nay, the words of the Novice are put upon us for those of the Genius in this Dialogue, and the Platonic Death of Souls grossly mistaken for their Annihilation,* (15.) *This is compar'd with Gobar's like treatment of S. Justin, and Photius's Vindication is alleg'd in his behalf,* (16.) *Thus much in answer to Mr. Dodwel, after which succeed several clear Testimonies of S. Justin, asserting not only that the Soul is of its own Nature Immortal, but that 'tis such by virtue of its Creation,* (17, 18, 19, 20.) *The appeal is continued by Mr. Dodwel to the Testimony of Tatian the Heretic; of which an advantage is duly taken, and tho' they agree, not so much in their Opinion, as Design, yet the guilt thereof is chargeable upon Mr. Dodwel, who would have pleaded that Heretic as a primitive Authority,* (21, 22.) *His next Author is S. Irenæus, in his Dissertations on whose Works Mr. Dodwel has before laid the grounds of this Opinion,* (23.) *But this Father at large asserts the Soul's natural Immortality: and by a strange mixture of Mistake and Fallacy, is intirely misrepresented by Mr. Dodwel,* (24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29.) *Next to the depravation of Irenæus, a very foreign and improper sentence is quoted by Mr. Dodwel from Athenagoras, (30.) but several pertinent ones are now added, to prove that*
he

The Contents.

he thought all Human Souls to be created of an Immortal Substance, (31.) A Passage of Theophilus Antiochenus, concerning the middle state in which the whole Man was at first created, is preposterously urg'd by Mr. Dodwel, in this Dispute about the state of the Soul, (32, 33.) and a Testimony of the same Author, when speaking distinctly of the Soul, is perverted by him, (34.) Tertullian protests most sollicitously, that whatever he has said of the materiality of the Soul, he yet holds it to be indivisible and indissoluble, and (whatever becomes of his other Opinions) naturally immortal. He is for this reason therefore a firmer Witness of the Soul's Immortality, than if he had held nothing that seem'd to clash with such a Doctrine, (35, 36, 37.) Some Figurative Expressions of S. Cyprian, concerning our new Birth by Baptism, are strain'd by Mr. Dodwel in favour of an adscititious Baptismal Spirit; but the remarkable silence of S. Cyprian concerning so great and so mysterious a Privilege, argues it a meer fiction: otherwise he would have largely pleaded it against the Novatian Schism, (38.) The crude unchristian Opinions of Arnobius, wrote while he was still an Heathen, are to be charg'd as so much Heresy upon Mr. Dodwel, and not set up (as he desires) for an Example of Catholic Authority, (39.) Mr. Dodwel
has

The Contents.

has given a genuine instance of his own Reasoning, by his violent misrepresentation of Lactantius; an Author not more famous for his Eloquence, than for his Defence of the Soul's natural Immortality, (40, 41, 42, 43, 44.) He deals, at last, no less injuriously with S. Athanasius, falsifying his Opinion from foreign Passages, and passing by others that are decisive of the Question, (45, 46, 47, 48.) He pleads S. Athanasius in like manner for his distinction between Soul and Spirit, tho' that distinction was now quitted by Him and others, in opposition to the Apollinarian Heresy, (49, 50.) The appeal is now clos'd with a rule of Vincentius Lirinensis, together with an aggravating circumstance of Mr. Dodwel's Heresy, (51.) Other Authors not appeal'd to by Mr. Dodwel, attest the Soul's natural Immortality, and are, in that point, of equal Authority with those who preceded them, (52.) The ground-work of Mr. Dodwel's Hypothesis, so unknown to the first Catholic Doctors, agrees too notoriously with the Gnostics, and other Heretics of that Age, (53, 54.) 'Tis likewise parallel to some other of his strange productions, (55.) and needs nothing but its own unreasonableness to explode it, (56.) The foregoing Dispute, which has been all along humbly submitted to the Judgment of our Superiors in the Church, concludes at length with three short Reflections address'd to Mr. Dodwel.



I N I S.

